STORAGE-ITEM
MAIN

LP9-Q27B
U.B.C. LIBRARY

MEMOIRS

OF THE

REV. AMMI ROGERS, A. M.

A CLERGYMAN OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH, EDUCATED AT YALE COLLEGE IN CONNECTICUT, ORDAINED IN TRINITY CHURCH IN THE CITY OF NEW-YORK,—

PERSECUTED IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, ON ACCOUNT OF RELIGION AND POLITICS, FOR ALMOST TWENTY YEARS:

And finally,

FALSELY ACCUSED AND IMPRISONED

In Norwich Jail, for two years, on the charge of Crimes said to have been committed in the town of Griswold, in the county of New London, when he was not within about

ONE HUNDRED MILES OF THE PLACE,

And of which he was absolutely as innocent as the Judge who pronounced the sentence, or as any other person in the world.

COMPOSED, COMPILED, AND WRITTEN BY THE SAID

AMMI ROGERS,

Late Rector of St. Peter's Church in Hebron, Tolland Co. Conn. &c.

"Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Behold and see, if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me."—*Jerem.*

"*Quis talia fando temperet a lacrymis?*"—Virgil.—*i. e.*

Who can refrain from tears at the relation of such things.

SECOND EDITION.

SCHENECTADY: PRINTED BY G. RITCHIE, JUN.

1826.

who had always been their friend! Oh, how I lament, how I deplore and bemoan their sin, their ingratitude, their baseness!—"Oh, that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people."

For courts of law to err, is not uncommon; but the injustice of which I here complain, is neither common nor small; I feel to forgive my enemies, persecutors and slanderers, but I desire that truth and justice may come to light; that perjury, wickedness, and vice may be suppressed. "He that hath an ear to hear let him hear." In this world the justice and goodness of the divine government will often escape the satisfaction of the most pious and diligent inquirer; the innocent are often condemned, while the guilty go clear, and with a fair character. Virtue is condemned to the punishment of vice, and vice receives the reward of virtue. Jesus Christ, himself, is born in a manger, while the murderous Herod, who had put 14.000 children to death, who were two years old and under, ascends the throne of Israel. The good St. Paul is a prisoner in chains while the bloody Nero sways the sceptre of the whole Roman Empire. The good John Rogers is burnt at the stake in Smithfield, by the Roman Catholics, while the infamous Bonner is the first bishop in England.—The good Lewis the sixteenth is beheaded, while the ambitious and hypocritical Bonaparte, who had drenched Europe with blood, murdered 6000 men between Java and Gaza in Asia, and changed God's holy Sabbaths to the tenth day, ascends the throne of France. The amiable Major Andre is hung at West Point, like a thief, and a murderer, while the traitorous and detestable Arnold is a Major General. The Rev. Ammi Rogers is a prisoner in Norwich, in Connecticut, while the hypocritical, coxcomical and detestable James Lanman is a Senator of the United States, while the suborners of perjury in the case of Mr. Rogers are at the bar, or in the faculty; but now by the just judgment of God, are stripped of the small portion of respect which they once received.

That equal justice is always done to all men in this world, is not true; and on this ground, even the heathen philosophers very justly argued the existence of a God, and the immortality of the soul; for say they, if there be a God, he must be

a God of justice; and since all men do not receive equal justice in this world, there must be a future state of existence, in which the righteous Governor of the Universe will evidently distinguish between those who love and practice that which is just and good, and those who do not. In this world, the best and most moral men, the very salt of the earth, are often despised and neglected; nay, they are insulted, scandalized, persecuted, imprisoned, and even put to death as the worst of human beings; while cheats, thieves, liars, adulterers, and duellists, who are murderers; nay, the very vilest and most profane and immoral men, the very offscouring of all human society, are caressed and admired, are voted for and promoted: they ride upon the high places of the earth, they walk in robes or lawn, they are adorned with a CROWN, or a MITRE, and are unmindful of their mortality or accountability. But the venerable Dr. Watts very excellently describes their situation in his paraphrase of the 73d Psalm, when he says,

> "Lord, what a thoughtless wretch was I
> To mourn and murmur and repine,
> To see the wicked placed on high,
> In pride and robes of honour shine,
> But Oh, their end, their dreadful end!" &c.

In the final judgment of the world, the justice and goodness of the divine government, will be made manifest to every understanding. Then shall the innocent be protected, while the guilty are confounded. Then shall the meek, the humble, and the persecuted be exalted and rewarded, while the proud, the unjust, the malicious, and oppressive shall be brought low and punished. In that day, there will be nothing hid which shall not be made manifest, there will be no deception which shall not be detected, no injustice which shall not be rectified; and unless by faith and repentance we come to God, in the appointed means of divine grace, we shall all likewise perish. The justice of God must be vindicated, the guilty must be punished, the innocent must be protected and rewarded, or the throne of Heaven must fall. By the deeds of the law no flesh can live. We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God: but in, and through him "*who died for our offences and rose again for our justification*,"

every son and daughter of the human race may obtain forgiveness and be for ever happy with the Lord, and with each other.

Though from my fellow men I have not deserved the disgrace, the imprisonment, and the affliction loaded upon me, and upon my friends; yet before that God unto whom "all hearts are open, all desires are known, and from whom no secrets are hid," in other respects, I have often offended in thought, word, and deed, and as I hope and expect God, for Christ's sake to forgive me; so I feel in my heart to forgive my enemies, persecutors and slanderers, and pray God to turn their hearts. Still I feel it my duty, in the promotion of truth and justice, in the suppression of perjury, wickedness and vice, and in the conveyance of that knowledge which may be honorable to God and useful to mankind, to lay before the public the following Memoirs, which I entreat the reader to peruse with attention, and consider with candour; and to believe me his persecuted friend and humble servant in the ministry of the Gospel of peace and reconciliation in the Lord Jesus Christ.

AMMI ROGERS.

Hebron, October 7th, 1823.

MEMOIRS, &c.

CHAPTER I.

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MY LIFE AND MINISTRY.

I, AMMI ROGERS, was born in the town of Branford, in the county of New-Haven, in the state of Connecticut, on the 26th of May, in or about the year of our Lord, 1770. My father was Thomas Rogers, who departed this life in Branford, on the 23d of June, 1804, aged 79. He was the son of Josiah Rogers, who departed this life in Branford, about the year 1750, aged 86. He came from Long Island, was a son of one of three brothers who came from England and were grandsons of the celebrated John Rogers, a clergyman of the Church of England, burnt by the Roman Catholics in Smithfield, in the first year of the reign of queen Mary, 1554. My grandfather was one of the proprietors of the town of Branford; he owned and occupied the extensive farm and mills which are now owned and occupied by my brother Josiah Rogers, and which have been in possession of the family from about the earliest settlement of the town. My mother, before she was married was Rebecca Hobart, daughter of Abijah Hobart, of Stonington, in New-London county. By him, a relation with the family of Masons is claimed; also, with the Rev. Mr. Hobart, the former minister of Fairfield, and his descendants. My grandmother Rogers was a Goodsell—my grandmother Hobart was a Bartholomew. My brothers were, Abijah, Rufus, Thomas, Josiah, Eliphalet and Hobart—my sister was Irene, who is married to Thelus Todd—and, except the false and scandalous accusations charged upon me, there never was, so far as I know or believe, a stain or even suspicion of immorality fixed upon my father or mother, grandfather or grandmother, brother or sister. Perhaps there is not in Connecticut, a family which

is and always has been more exempt from the practice of every vice, than that to which I have the honor to belong. In the year 1783, I entered the academy in Litchfield, under the tuition of Mr. Osborn, and boarded in the family of the Hon. Andrew Adams, who was related to my father's family. In the year 1786, I entered Yale College in New-Haven, under the direction of the Rev. President Stiles. Here I became more seriously impressed with the importance of religion, and the awful concerns of eternity. My parents were pious, and strict in the Congregational Presbyterian religion, and I had been brought up in that way. From my earliest childhood, I had been impressed with a sense of God, of his omniscience, omnipresence, omnipotence, and of my own accountability. But human inability and human accountability were so contrary to the justice and goodness of God, that I sheltered myself under the doctrine of unconditional election and forecordination. This was taught in my catechism, and if that were true, I was safe; but when I became convicted of my lost and undone condition by nature, and by practice, I perceived that if God should enter into judgment with his creatures, by the deeds of the law, no man living could be justified; for cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them, and the law extends to the very thoughts of the heart, as well as to the outward actions of the body; that we were called upon to rend our hearts and not our garments, to be up and doing while the day lasts; that we were admonished, that now was the accepted time, that now was the day of salvation. I perceived that I had no power of myself, to help myself: that my sufficiency for any thing which was good and acceptable to God, must come from God, that his grace was sufficient for me and for all men; therefore did he invite all the ends of the earth to look to him and be saved; therefore did he expostulate with his people, why will ye die, O house of Israel! The sacrifices under the law, and the atonement made by Jesus Christ under the Gospel, were sufficient for all men, even the greatest of sinners. I found my disposition changed; I found myself enlightened as to divine and spiritual things; I found my affections, my prospects, my anticipations

and expectaions were not on predestination and fore-ordination, but on the mercy of God, through the merits and atonement of Christ. In this way I became converted, and as a grateful return to the great Father of all mercies, I determined, and I thought it my duty to preach the gospel, the good news to all men—free salvation to every son and daughter of the human race; and the unspeakable danger to which they expose themselves, if they neglect so great salvation. I could not perceive the propriety of preaching free salvation to all men, if it were not possible for all men to be saved; and if it were possible for all men to be saved, then the doctrine which I had been taught must be false. That God had, from all eternity, foreordained who should be saved and who should be damned, I could not reconcile with the truth of his word, in swearing by himself that he desired not the death of a sinner; in inviting all the ends of the earth to look to him and be saved; in saying that his mercy was over all his works; in being the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world; in saying that this will be the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men have loved darkness rather than light; in saying that the grace of God, *which bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto all men*, teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world. Now to say, that God never designed, nor intended, nor wished, nor put it in the power of all mankind to be saved, was, in my opinion, neither honorable to God, nor useful to mankind, nor did I believe it to be true. But if people will do despite the spirit of grace, if they will resist the Holy Ghost, if they will perjure themselves and pervert the cause of justice, mercy and goodness, if they do not use the means of grace, but live and die in the disposition and practice of what they know to be wrong, they will be damned, they must be miserable and wretched. Wherefore, saith the prophet, "let the wicked forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." The great design of all true religion, and of all good preaching, is to change the natural

disposition of the human heart, which is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, and to induce all mankind to live that sober, righteous, and godly life, while in this world, which will terminate in everlasting happiness in the world to come.

While I was a member of College, my religious convictions were strong, my impressions were deep, my conversion was hopeful and joyous, but my views of the doctrines of religion were varient from the Saybrook confession of faith, and the Assembly's Catechism, though at that time an opportunity had not occurred for me to examine any other system. At length I obtained permission to attend, for half a day, divine worship in the Episcopal Church; and although I was a stranger to their church government and worship, yet their doctrine was liberal, and conformable to what I had previously thought. This induced an inquiry into the origin of the religion in which I had been educated, and I found that when our forefathers first came to this country, they came from England; that when they came from England they came from the Church of England, *and were Dissenters from that Church.* This induced an enquiry into the cause and ground of their separation—into what they gained, and into what they lost. This brought to view a subject with which I was wholly unacquainted, viz. the government of the christian church, the authority necessary in the regular and due administration of the sacraments, the articles of the christian faith, and the worship of God as practised by churchmen and dissenters. About this time appeared the letters of the Rev. Dr. Bowden to president Stiles, on the subject of a lenial succession of Bishops, by a valid ordination, which were not answered. I also read Potter on Church Government, Cave's Lives of the Fathers, Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, and many other excellent writers on the part of the church. I also read a history of the Puritans in England, the New England Memorial, Mather's Magnalia, and the Cambridge and Saybrook Platforms, with such other books as I could find on the part of the dissenters. My earnest endeavor was to learn and know the truth, and that I might have a disposition to act accordingly. At this time, I never had within my knowledge, seen a Bap-

tist, Methodist, or a Quaker, but was fully satisfied that whoever departed from the government of any society, departed from that society; that whoever departed from the government of the christian church, did, by that very act, depart from the church, and was in danger of loosing the benefit of all that Christ had done, and suffered for him; that as no one could lawfully act in the name of another without his authority, so no one could lawfully baptize or administer the sacrament, or hold forth the terms of life and salvation to a guilty world, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost without authority from God; that this authority could only be obtained in an immediate and extraordinary commission from Heaven, and then immediate and extraordinary works must be produced to prove it, for God never requires his creatures to believe that which he has not given them evidence to believe; or it must be obtainedby a succession. To pretend to work miracles, or to produce extraordinary works, was ridiculous and vain; to claim a succession, authentic documents must be produced to prove it; and this could only be done in the Episcopal church, which included the Greek, Latin, English, and other churches, but not the dissenters from the church of England. Many very able, and pious men and women were among them, but I could not be satisfied, that by their separation from the government, doctrine, and worship of the universal church, they had gained any thing which was honorable to God, or useful to mankind; for in the Episcopal church they might be as able, as amiable, and as pious as they could be in their own way. But they had lost much.

I could not but think they were mistaken in separating from the church of England, but at the same time adopted this mode of reasoning, viz. after diligent inquiry and fair examination, I sincerely think that I am right in my religion, but I claim not infallibility—I may be mistaken; if I am, I hope God will forgive me; others may be as sincere in their religion, as I am in mine. If I say that God will not forgive them, how can I expect him to forgive me, if I should happen to be wrong. So that whoever shall pass sentence of condemnation upon his fellow christian, it is a sentence of

condemnation passed by himself, upon himself, if he happens to be wrong. True it is, that two things, which are opposite in themselves, cannot both be right at the same time, and every person who differs from me, must think that I am wrong, or that he himself is wrong; and woe unto them who shall make no difference between right and wrong! But let each one say for himself in the language of the Poet,

"Let not this weak, unknowing hand,
Presume thy bolts to throw,
And deal damnation round the land,
On each I deem thy foe.

If I am right, oh! teach my heart
Still in the right to stay:
If I am wrong, thy grace impart
To find the better way."

While a member of College, I left the congregational Presbyterian religion, in which my parents and I had been brought up, and joined the Episcopal church; and I did it because I then thought, and now think it was my duty. I thought that the Episcopal church was of divine appointment; that in it the sacraments were administered by divine and undoubted authority; that the doctrines taught in that church were in every point of view honorable to God, and useful to man, and supported by the authority of God's word; that the worship of God in that church did not depend upon the discretion or indiscretion of any one man, and was not as various and as discordant as the tempers, dispositions, and abilities of all those who should lead in their devotions; but was founded upon the temper and disposition of the gospel and supported by the authority of the holy scriptures. In this church, there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all, working in due season, that we should bring forth the fruits of a virtuous and good life. Constantly to unite in the same forms of worship has a tendency to bring us all to the same disposition, and a sameness of disposition creates friendship in all beings and in all worlds, (so far as my knowledge extends) and by this says our blessed Saviour, shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another.

A PRAYER.

"O, Almighty and Everlasting God, who alone can govern the unruly wills and affections of sinful men, make me, beseech thee, at all times to love those things which thou dost command, and to desire those things which thou dost promise, that so, among the sundry and manifold changes of the world, my heart may surely there be fixed, where true joys are to be found, through Jesus Christ my Lord."

Our Father who art in heaven, &c.

CHAPTER II.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH CONTINUED.

I was graduated at Yale College, in New-Haven, Connecticut, in the year 1790; and soon after, was placed under the direction of the Rev. Mr. Jarvis in Middletown, (afterwards bishop Jarvis,) in the study of divinity and ecclesiastical history, and boarded in his family. My situation soon became unpleasant in consequence of his churlish behaviour in his family and neglect to give me suitable instruction. I left his house and was placed under the direction, in my studies, of the Rev Edward Blakeslee, of North Haven, and the Rev. Doctor Mansfield, of Derby At this, Mr. Jarvis appeared to be mortified and displeased; his endeavors to excite a disgust against me, in the minds of some of the clergy and laity of the Episcopal Church, were soon communicated to me, and I soon became sensible of the effects of them. Application was made to me, to perform divine service, and to preach, under the direction of the Rev. Doct. Mansfield, in the churches in Waterbury, in Woodbury, and in Salem, which I did to the unanimous approbation of the parishes. But Mr. Jarvis, by the consent of bishop Seabury, soon sent Mr. Hart, then a candidate for the ministry, to take charge of these parishes. This excited uneasiness, and a division among them. I declined performing service there, the church in Salem refused to employ Mr. Hart, and unfriendly

feelings were excited. In the year 1791, I attended the Convention or Convocation of the church, in Watertown with a view of being examined and admitted as a candidate, but perceiving the hostile disposition of Mr. Jarvis, and the influence he had gained with some of the clergy, I withdrew without offering myself, or making my intentions known. And wishing to avoid any thing unpleasant, I received letters of recommendation from the Rev. Dr. Mansfield, the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee, and others; also from the church in Branford, Northford, and others, and went into the state of New-York, and commenced a Reader in the churches in Schenectady and Ballston, under the direction of the Rev. Mr. Ellison, of Albany. In this situation, having given notice to the bishop of New York, I remained until the next year, when I was recommended to the said bishop of New York, and standing committee of the church in that state, for deacon's orders, by the Rev. Dr. Mansfield, and the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee, in whose families I had resided, and studied divinity and ecclesiastical history; by the church in Branford, where I had been born and brought up, and where I had been known from my infancy, and where public notice had been given to the congregation, assembled in the church, for public worship on Sunday, the 15th day of April 1792, that in the month of June, in that year, I should apply to the bishop and standing committee of the church, in the state of New York, to be ordained a deacon, and they were then solemnly called upon in the name of God, if they knew any thing scandalous in my conduct or character, or any just cause or reason why I should not be ordained, to let it be known within one month, that it might be communicated to the proper authority. I was also recommended as aforesaid, by the church in Northford, by the church in Guilford, by the church in Ballston, and by the church in the city of Schenectady, where I then resided, and by the Rev. Mr. Ellison of Albany, under whose care and direction I had been employed as a reader for about one year; with these recommendations, and my diploma from college, I offered myself to the aforesaid bishop and standing committee, to be examined and ordained a deacon; and on the 18th and 19th days of June, 1792, I was examined by the Right Rev.

Bishop Provoost, and the said standing committee, at the house of the Rev. Dr. (*afterwards bishop.*) Moore, in the city of New York. First, on my internal call, and views in regard to the ministry; on that change of the natural disposition, which is necessary to fit us for God's heavenly kingdom; in my knowledge and belief in the holy scriptures, and my earnest intention by God's grace to conform my heart and practice to them; in my knowledge of the English, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages; in my knowledge of a general system and body of divinity and ecclesiastical history; in my knowledge of the lives and travels of the apostles and primitive fathers of the church; in my knowledge of the general and liberal arts and sciences, &c.; and after two days strict trial and full examination and with the aforesaid recommendations, I was honorably approved, accepted, and recommended to the said bishop, as the canons directed, to be ordained. The day after this recommendation, the Rev. Mr. Jarvis, of Middletown, in Connecticut, came to New-York and informed the Rev. Dr. Beach, one of the said standing committee, that I was a very unworthy young man, and had actually been refused holy orders in Connecticut. I assured Dr. Beach, that Mr. Jarvis was my enemy, because I had left his house, and refused to live and study with him, and that what he had said was not true. I requested him to suspend his judgment, and not to mention what Mr. Jarvis had said, until I could go to Connecticut and obtain further recommendations, and a certificate from the secretary, that I had not been refused orders in that state. This he consented to do, and I accordingly went to the Rev. Dr. Dibble, of Stamford, stated my case to him; requested him to examine me and my documents, and if he should find me worthy and well qualified, to recommend me to the bishop and standing committee of New York, to be ordained. This he very freely did, and at the same time expressed his astonishment at the conduct of Mr. Jarvis. I then went to the Rev. Mr. Ogdesvie, of Norwalk, made the same statement and request, and obtained the same recommendation. I then went to the Rev. Mr. Shelton, of Newfield, to the Rev. Mr. Clark, of Huntington, and to the Rev. Mr. Marsh, of New-Milford, made to them in

dividually the same communication and request, and after due examination, received the same recommendation from them. I then went to the house of the Rev. Mr. Perry, of Newtown, who was secretary of the Convention of Connecticut, to obtain a certificate, that I had not been refused holy orders in that state, in order to contradict the falsehood of Mr. Jarvis. When I arrived there, Mr. Perry was from home on a journey; I stated my business to Mrs. Perry, and wished to examine the records, which I did in her presence, and in the presence of a Mr. Isaac Davis who was there, a young gentleman with whom I was acquainted, when I was a member of college: not finding my name on the record, as I was sure it was not, Mr. Perry being from home, the day of my ordination having been appointed, and nothing but the evidence of a plain matter of fact wanted; Mr. Davis consented to give a certificate in the name of Mr. Perry, that no act of the bishop and clergy of Connecticut, had been passed, refusing me orders in that state; this he did—and with this certificate, and with these recommendations, I returned to New York, satisfied Dr. Beach, (*who was only one of a committee of eight, and only a majority was necessary,*) and I was ordained a deacon, in Trinity church, in the city of New-York, by the Right Rev. Samuel Provoost, D. D. bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in that state, on the twenty-fourth day of June, A. D. 1792.

On the day after my ordination, I called on the said Dr. Beach for my papers and documents, as they could be of no use to him. Those which were directed to the standing committee he claimed as vouchers for his conduct in recommending me, and refused to return them; but the certificate written by Mr. Davis, was not directed to any body, and was returned to me. On my way home, which was in Schenectady, I went to the house of Mr. Perry, in Newtown, gave him the certificate which Mr. Davis had given me in his absence, told him how I came by it, and what it was given for. His reply was, "I am sorry that I was not at home when you was here before, for I should have been glad to have afforded you every assistance in my power, and am glad that Mr. Davis gave you this certificate." He then tore it in two, and gave

me one half of it, as we were standing near each other. He then said, " to prevent any difficulty that may arise, I had better give you one myself, and then sat down and wrote the following, with his own hand, and which is now in my possession, viz.

" *This may certify, that no act has ever been passed by the Convocation of the clergy of Connecticut, prohibiting the Rev. Mr. Ammi Rogers receiving holy orders in this church.*

Certified by

PHILO PERRY, *Secretary of Convocation.*

July 5th, 1792."

Soon after my return to Schenectady, I received the following letter, addressed to

The Rev. Ammi Rogers, Schenectady.

New-York, August 7th, 1792.

Reverend Sir,

Suffer me to congratulate you on your ordination, and to wish you all possible success and happiness. From my acquaintance with you, I feel strongly impressed with an idea of your eminence. I have seen the Rev. Mr. Perry, of Newtown, and informed him that I had given you a certificate, and put his name to it; he said I had done right, and that he had seen you since, and had given you one to the same purport in his own hand writing, and that the one which I wrote was destroyed. I have some expectation of being in your part of the country this fall; if such a thing should happen, I hope to have the pleasure of seeing you.

Your sincere friend and well wisher,

ISAAC DAVIS.

My ministry was blessed beyond what I had reason to expect, though not to exceed my endeavours; a sense of the divine Majesty, and all his adorable attributes, were deeply fixed in my mind, with an affecting impression of the awful responsibility of my office; my endeavours were to make my hearers sensible of their lost and undone situation by the natural depravity of their minds, and the absolute necessity of the use of all the means of grace, that they might be converted and enjoy the comfortable and blessed hope of glory, which would be that peace of God, which passeth all understanding, that

peace which this world could not give. My preaching and my endeavours were to represent the God of heaven, whom we adored, in the most amiable and pleasing point of view possible, and to persuade my people to love him, and to imitate him. As my preaching respected my fellow men, it was first to inform and enlighten their understanding in the most religious and moral doctrines and duties of Christianity, and then to move their affections, to believe and act accordingly.

From the 24th of June, 1792, to October, 1793, I administered 130 baptisms; I married 20 persons; and deposited five dead bodies of my fellow christians in the grave, "looking for the general resurrection in the last day, and the life of the world to come, through our Lord Jesus Christ"—Within the time last mentioned, the building of St. George's church in Schenectady, which during, and since the revolutionary war, had lain most of the time destitute, neglected, and greatly injured, was repaired and made comfortable. It was an elegant stone building, with a handsome steeple and a good organ, and had been well finished. It would be ungrateful and unjust not to mention the name of Mr. William Corlett, a man from the Isle of Man, whose pious attentions and generous contributions to St. George's church, in the city of Schenectady, ought never to be forgotten; for to his example and exertions that parish are much beholden. During this time also, the church in Ballston, from only about fourteen families, had become numerous and respectable, and their house of worship was raised and enclosed; the greatest friendship and harmony subsisted between me and all my people, and among themselves.

In October, 1793, I attended the convention of the Episcopal Church in the state of New York, assembled in the city of New-York, of which I was a member, and then made the foregoing returns to the bishop, received his approbation and thanks, with an invitation to preach in Trinity church, and in St. Paul's church, in the city of New-York, which I did. I was now in love, friendship, and fellowship with the bishop and all the clergy, with my own parishes, and with the whole church, except Mr. Jarvis, and some of his particular friends. With his

conduct I felt myself abused, though what he intended for my injury, had eventuated in my good and prosperity; for my situation in the state of New-York was much better than I could have expected in Connecticut. I was favoured with thousands of blessings, and my great and earnest care was to make a grateful and practical return, by a conscientious discharge of my ordination vows, and a holy, humble, and exemplary walk before God and his people, of every denomination. Oh how often have I alone, with closed doors, on my knees, before God, read the ordination service of the Episcopal church, with prayers, and tears, and fasting, that God of his great mercy, would please to direct and assist me in all my doings, with his most gracious favour and further me with his continual help, that in all my works, begun, continued, and ended in him, I might glorify his holy name, and finally, that I, and all committed to my care, and the whole world of mankind, might obtain everlasting life and happiness, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

CHAPTER III.

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH CONTINUED.

The year 1794 was to me vastly important. In that year I was married to the very amiable Miss Margaret Bloore, about 18 years old, of an excellent disposition, and well educated. She was the only daughter of Mr. Joshua Bloore, a gentleman from Manchester, in England; who came into this country and settled as a merchant in Albany, and afterwards moved into the county of Saratoga, where I became acquainted with him and his family. His wife, before he married her, was a Margaret Brintnal, of Langly parish, in Derbyshire, in England. In that year, I was recommended to the bishop and standing committee of the Episcopal church, in the state of New-York; was again examined by them as before, was recommended by the said standing committee, to be ordain-

ed by the said bishop. And in Trinity church, in the city of New-York, on the 19th day of October, A. D. 1794, I was ordained a PRIEST, by the Right Rev. Samuel Provoost, D. D. bishop of the Protestant Episcopal church in the state of New-York. Before this, it was known that Dr. Beach and Mr. Jarvis had become reconciled in regard to the falsehood communicated relative to me; and he was left out of the said standing committee, though he attended, and assisted at my ordination as a PRIEST, and received the sacrament of the Lord's supper with me at that time. But the same night, after the ordination, he complained to the bishop that I had brought to him a forged certificate, before I was ordained a DEACON. The next day the bishop called us both before him, and caused an inquiry. I stated to him the case as it was, relative to the certificate which Mr. Davis had given to me, in the absence of Mr. Perry; that on my way home I called on Mr. Perry, informed him what was done, and gave him the certificate; that he approved of it and gave another to the same purport, in his own hand writing, which I then laid before the bishop, with the letter of Mr. Davis, dated August 7th, 1792. Dr. Beach acknowledged, before the bishop, that the facts were true, as I state I them, but said he thought there ought to be an investigation. The bishop replied that he did not know how that could be brought against me as a PRIEST, which took place before I was a deacon - that Dr Beach was present, and assisted at my ordination as a priest, and if he had any objection, then, or before, was the time to make it; that I had undergone a better examination, and was amply recommended, by more clergymen, and more churches than any one he had ever ordained, and the result of my ministry proved that he had not been imposed upon; that in all forgeries, there must be some falsehood, but in this case, there is no pretence of falsehood, and it would be very unlikely that so many respectable clergymen and parishes would recommend me to be ordained in New-York, if I had been refused orders in Connecticut or if I was unworthy of the ministry; that the certificate itself was a mere evidence of fact, such as any one might have given, who had examined the records; *that it was obtained, and used,*

not to prevent truth and justice, but to suppress an acknowledged falsehood; and he therefore decided that Dr. Beach had no cause of complaint, and dismissed the inquiry, desiring us to be reconciled. Dr. Beach then, in the presence of the bishop, requested me to overlook all that had passed between us, offered me his hand in friendship, and asked me to preach for him the next Sunday, in St. George's church, in the city of New-York, the whole of which I complied with, and the matter was settled. Still there was not that cordiality between him and me, that there was between me and the other clergy.

From October, 1793, to October, 1794, I administered 184 baptisms: married 18 persons, and buried 11, and had preached 176 sermons; my ministerial labours had become very extensive, and I had reason to believe, very acceptable. When in the city of New-York, I preached in Trinity church, in St. Paul's church, and in St. George's chapel, in Beekman street. Reflecting on the occurrences of this year, I feel to express myself in the words of the 14th hymn, in the book of Common Prayer, viz.

> "When all thy mercies, O my God,
> My rising soul surveys,
> Transported with the view, I'm lost
> In wonder, love and praise." &c.

My general practice was to encourage family devotion every day, setting the example myself; to compose and write my own sermons, and the subject was taken from that part of the holy scriptures, which, by the established order of the Episcopal church, every minister was obliged to read to his people on that day.

From Oct. 1794 to Oct. 1795, I administered 123 baptisms; admitted, upon their credible profession of faith, repentance, and an earnest intention, by God's grace, to lead a new and better life, 90 persons to the holy communion; I joined 20 persons in marriage, deposited 8 dead bodies of my fellow christians in the grave, and I delivered about 160 sermons; was much given to reading, to study, to self examination and to prayer. I attended the convention, was in great love and friendship with the Bishop, with my brethren the clergy and

with the laity. I preached in most of the Episcopal churches in the city of New-York, and returned to my parishes with a renewed determination that I would, by God's help, fulfil my ordination engagements.

At this time my ministerial labours extended to almost every part of the county of Saratoga, and to some of the neighboring counties.

From October 1795 to October 1796, I administered 246 baptisms. The number of communicants had increased to 120. I married 3[illegible] persons, and buried 8.

From Oct. 1796, to Oct. 1797 I administered 186 baptisms; my communicants had increased to 158. I married 14 persons and buried 4.

In the year 1797, there was a very unhappy occurrence. Delegates from the state of New-York to the general convention of the Episcopal church in the United States, to be holden in the city of Philadelphia, were to be appointed, for the purpose, among other things, of revising the 39 articles of religion of the church of England, and of adopting them in this country, or of rejecting them. It so happened that in this election the clergy were almost unanimous in my favor and the laity were about equally divided in their choice between the Rev. Dr. Beach, my former opposer, and me. In this way they balloted eleven times, each party adhering to his vote and no choice was made, when the said Dr. Beach arose and said, if my brethren the clergy suppose that that young man, meaning me, is better qualified to fill that most important station in the church—one of the most important stations in the church that ever was or perhaps ever will be, when the articles of religion in the whole church in the United States are to be arranged and settled, I now declare that I will not accept the appointment, nor will I ever set in this convention with him again. He then took his hat, went off, apparently in anger, and I was almost unanimously elected; went to Philadelphia on that business, and was a member of the said general convention in 1797, '98 and '99. I was at the same time a member of the convention of the Episcopal church in the state of New-York, as I had been for five years before: and it is believed that few clergymen of my age had

received more honor, more approbation, and more preferments among his brethren, in the convention and in the church than I had; though with those who had, in my opinion, unreasonably dissented from the church of England and the established order of the christian church, there was continual warfare. Soon after my return from the convention in 1797 I received the following letter from the Rev. Dr. Moore afterwards Bishop Moore, viz.

To the Rev. Ammi Rogers, in Ballston.

DEAR SIR— *New York, Dec. 11th*, 1797.

I have been expecting for some days past a letter either from you or from Mr. Ellison, respecting the business of the Lutheran church, for the management of which, you know we are the committee appointed by the convention. I wish you would attend to it, and let me know the result of your deliberations.

Doctor Beech is very much displeased at your appointment as a delegate to the general convention. He conceives himself insulted by putting you in the place which he supposes ought to have been filled by himself, and seems to think it necessary to shew by depreciating your character that the convention made an improper choice. I called on him the day before yesterday to converse with him on the subject; he charges you with having brought forged recommendations, when you applied for holy orders. I told him I should certainly state the matter to you; and I wish you would give me some explanation of this business, so that, if it be practicable, I may check the evil reports which some people are circulating among our brethren the clergy, and I have reason to think among the laity also. You know the high sense I entertain of your industry and utility in the church: and to rub off any stain which calumny may attempt to throw upon innocence, will be a great satisfaction to your friend and brother.

BENJAMIN MOORE.

To the foregoing letter, I sent the following answer:

To the Rev. Dr. Benjamin Moore, New-York.

Ballston, December 20th, 1797.

REV. AND DEAR SIR—

I received your favor of the 11th inst. this morning, and

now thank you for taking my part in my absence. When Dr. Beach says that I brought forged recommendations, when I applied for holy orders, IT IS A NOTORIOUS FALSEHOOD, and he knows it. The matter to which he alludes was fully inquired into by Bishop Provoost, some years ago, viz. on the day after I was ordained a PRIEST; and was by him dismissed as unworthy of notice, and to him I refer you for information on the subject. [*See pages* 17, 18, 21.] I wish you and Mr. Bissitt would call on Bishop Provoost on the subject, and then inform Dr. Beach and his friends what the Bishop says about it; this will make him look meaner than he now does, *if possible*.

As to the business of the Lutheran church, Mr. Ellison and I have had a consultation on the subject, and are calculating to see the Rev. Mr. Quitman, when we will let you know more about it; I think the prospect is favorable. I have a call to attend a funeral in Galway, and must bid you farewell, and I am, dear sir, with every sentiment of esteem and affection, your much obliged friend and brother.

AMMI ROGERS.

Bishop Provoost entirely satisfied the Rev. Dr. Moore, and the Rev. Mr. Bissitt, on the subject of Mr. Perry's certificate, which Dr. Beach had most falsely and most unjustly called forged recommendations, when I applied for holy orders, and I heard no more of it until 1803.

From October 1797, to October 1798, I administered 254 baptisms; my communicants were 108; I joined 36 persons in marriage, and attended 19 funerals; and preached about 180 sermons. There was but one country clergyman in the state of New-York, at that time, whose returns to the bishop, or whose ministerial labors were as extensive as mine.

From October 1798, to October 1799, when as usual I attended the convention, I administered 168 baptisms; had 210 communicants, married 16 persons, attended 13 burials, preached about 170 sermons.

At this time, an anabaptist teacher had commenced an attack upon me, and upon the church, by publishing in the newspaper, printed in Ballston, an anonymous piece against the observance of Christmas, and the other festivals of the

church. This piece was answered by me, and that again was answered by him, and thus the dispute was pursued for many months, with great warmth on both sides; until at length a public discussion was personally had in the Court-house in Ballston, in presence of many hundreds of people. The result was, as might have been expected, no conviction of error on either side; but, worsted in argument my antagonist and his party had recourse to personal invective; this was replied to by the wardens and vestry of the church in Ballston and by more than forty of my nearest neighbors, of every denomination; in which my conduct and character, both as a minister and as a man, were fully vindicated.

From October 1799, to October 1800, I administered 137 baptisms; my communicants had increased to 228, I married 28 persons, and buried 5, and preached about 150 sermons, exclusive of many lectures and public exhortations.

This year was to me the beginning of sorrow. I had devoted myself entirely to the work of the ministry. In the county of Saratoga, my people had increased from about 14 families, to about 4000 souls; they had built a new church in Ballston and finished it with an elegant steeple, bell and organ. They had become incorporate, and built a new church with a handsome steeple, in the town of Milton, and also in the town of Stillwater. In Waterford they had become a body corporate, and a large number had joined that society; a very respectable society was also collected in Charlton and in Galway, and in other parts of that county. I had, some time before, resigned my parish in Schenectady to the Rev. Robert G. Wetmore, who was a very worthy man, and a most excellent clergyman, and my labors were extended to Fort Hunter and to Johnstown. I had visited and preached and administered sacraments in Boon's settlement, in Utica, in Paris, and in various parts of the county of Otsego; and in many other parts of the country, did I, as opportunity offered, extend the knowledge of what I conceived to be true religion; prosperity in the ministry, and a fair reputation, seemed to attend me wherever I went. It was customary for the wardens and vestrymen of the several parishes in my care, to meet at least once a year, to become acquainted with each

other, and to consult means for their mutual good and prosperity.

"*At a meeting of the wardens and vestrymen of the several Episcopal churches in the county of Saratoga, viz. in Ballston, Milton, Stillwater, Waterford, Charlton, Galway, Greenfield, and Providence, in the state of New-York, duly warned and convened in Ballston, February 1st.* 1800.

"*Voted unanimously*, That the thanks of the several churches in the county of Saratoga, be presented to the Rev. Ammi Rogers, for his unwearied labors and faithful services, in the promotion of religion; that owing to his abilities and discretion, the Episcopal church has become prosperous and respectable; that his exemplary piety and spotless morals, uniformly demonstrated in his life and conversation, merit our warmest acknowledgements; and that no exertions on our part shall be wanting, to render his situation comfortable and easy, and his life happy.

"The Rev. Mr. Rogers then thanked them for their politeness and attention to him since his first acquaintance with them. He said if there was any thing which could give him pleasure, it certainly would be the consciousness of having done his duty, and the love and approbation of his parishioners; that he then acknowledged with gratitude, that in his opinion, few clergymen could boast of more instances of attention and respect from his parishioners than he could; that he could not withhold his grateful acknowledgements to Almighty God for crowning his endeavors in the cause of religion, with a success far beyond his most sanguine expectations; that he felt himself happily situated, in regard to his parishioners, and if his past services and deportment had already met their approbation, and extracted from them a determination to afford him a support and to make his life easy and happy, he hoped that in future he should no less deserve it.

Attest. WARREN SMITH, *Secretary*."

In the summer and fall of 1800, a sickness prevailed in the county of Saratoga with which many died. My wife was taken with it, and on the eleventh day departed this life, in the 26th year of her age. When she was taken with the disease she was in full health and strength, with a child only a few months

old; medical aid was soon called for, and the most skilful physicians attended; but alas! to no other purpose than a momentary relief. The day but one before she died, she wrote the following lines, in my absence and they are the last words that she ever did write. *Given over by the physicans, and knowing that she must soon die, she begins with these words,*.

"Oh thou, unknown, Almighty cause,
Of all my hope and fear,
In whose dread presence, ere an hour,
Perhaps I must appear.
If I have wander'd in those
Paths of life I ought to shun,
As something, loudly, in my breast
Remonstrates I have done,
Thou know'st that thou hast formed me
With passions wild and strong,
And list'ning to their witching voice,
Has often led me wrong.
Where human weakness has come short,
Or frailty stepp'd aside;
Do thou, all good, for such thou art;
In shades of darkness hide.
Where with intention I have err'd,
No other plea I have,
But thou art good, and goodness still
Delighteth to forgive,"

Not more than two hours before she departed this life, by her request, I administered to her, and to our neighbours who were present, the sacrament of the Lord's supper; the service she performed with astonishing strength of mind and clearness of voice, and particularly she repeated this part with uncommon interest and energy, viz.

"Therefore with angels, and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name; evermore praising thee and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts; heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Glory be to thee, O Lord Most High. Amen."

Only a few minutes before she expired, I asked her if she felt willing to die. Her reply was, "you and I have always lived happy together, and for your sake, and for the sake of my children, I wish to live; but for me, it is, without doubt, to take me from some great unforeseen evil, which would be to me worse than death, if I were to live; it seems to be the

will of God that I should die, and I feel willing to obey it. The reader will excuse me in dwelling upon the last words and last moments of a much beloved and much respected wife; none can tell the anguish which I feel on this subject, except those who have experienced similar afflictions.

"To thee, my God and Saviour, I,
By day and night address my cry,
Vouchsafe my mournful voice to hear,
To my distress incline thine ear," &c.

88*th Psalm, in the Prayer Book.*

I was left with three small children, one an infant at the breast, and every thing appeared melancholy and gloomy even in my public and private devotions I was cast down; my studies were dull and lifeless, and it seemed as if the face of all goodness was hid from me. In the month of October, I went on a visit to my parents and friends, in Branford. I generally made it my business, after I had attended the Convention in the city of New-York every year to go to Branford and visit my friends, and to preach there one or two Sundays. A wish had often been expressed to me that I would return and settle there, but until now I never gave any encouragement. Overtures were soon made, and I delayed giving an answer until I had laid the case before the church in Ballston, and also before the bishop and clergy of New-York and of Connecticut. At this time I performed divine service, and preached for a few Sundays in the church in the city of Hartford; and was applied to for terms of settlement there, but refused to give any encouragement on account of the previous application made to me from Branford, and also because my people in the county of Saratoga were not informed of my inclination to leave them. I immediately wrote to Bishop Provoost, to the Rev. Doct. Moore, who was soon after Bishop Moore, and to some of the other clergy, stating to them my intention to leave that state. From the said Rev. Doct. Moore, I received the following letter, viz.

To the Rev. Ammi Rogers, Ballston.

New-York, Oct 23d, 1800.

My Dear Sir,

The day before yesterday, I received your letter by Mr.

Morgan, and must confess, that I am not a little surprised to find, upon perusing the contents, that you are deliberating about leaving Ballston. I have hitherto been of opinion that your labours have been so eminently successful in that quarter of the country, your ministrations so acceptable to the people, and your situation becoming so easy and comfortable, with respect to temporal emoluments; from all these considerations, I imagined that nothing could induce you to quit the county of Saratoga. You ask my advice on the occasion; it is impossible for me or any other brother clergyman, to give directions or to offer persuasions, on so delicate a subject. You will, no doubt, deem yourself obliged to exert all your abilities in advancing the kingdom of the Redeemer upon earth; you will earnestly seek the guidance of Him who is infinitely wise, and you will follow the dictates of conscience. Wherever you may think proper to fix yourself, be assured you have my sincere wishes and ardent prayers, for your temporal and eternal welfare.

Your affectionate brother,

BENJAMIN MOORE.

From the Rev. Doct. Moore, afterwards Bishop Moore, to the Rev. Ammi Rogers, Ballston.

New-York, Dec. 2d, 1800.

Dear Sir,

I wrote an answer to your letter from Hartford, but when I carried it to the house where Mr Morgan lodged he was gone; a young gentleman, to whom I delivered it, promised to forward it by the first opportunity. I must confess, it is not with a little uneasiness and disappointment, I hear of your intention to leave this state and settle in Connecticut. I have always considered you as one of our most useful and active clergymen, and although I know you will be equally zealous and industrious, wherever you may fix yourself, still it would be a satisfaction to retain a more immediate connection with you, as members of the same convention.

The vestry of St. Mark's church are negociating the business with Mr. Chase respecting a settlement in their church. Dr. Provoost has signified his intention to resign in the course of next spring, the Rectorship of Trinity church, and the

Episcopate of the state. Thus great changes in our ecclesiastical affairs will ere long take place: whatever my situation may be, you will be remembered with sentiments of esteem and affection, by your friend.

BENJAMIN MOORE.

I had preached with approbation in all the Episcopal churches in the city of New-York, ocasionally, for ten years; had been constantly a member of the convention of the church; for three years was a member of the general convention of the Episcopal church in the United States; was frequently on some of the most important committees of the church. I had been duly appointed and constituted one of the first members of the corporation of Union College, in the city of Schenectady, constantly attended their meetings, and exerted myself for the prosperity of that institution. I had been initated into the mysteries of Freemasonry, in that state, and had passed through the several degrees of Entered Apprentice, Fellow Craft, Master, Mark Master, Past Master, Most Excellent Master, and Royal Arch. I obtained the Mediterranean Pass, was dubbed a Knight of the Red Cross, became a Knight of Malta, and was admitted into the Encampment of Sir Knight Templars. When the Grand Chapter of Royal Arch Masons was first organized, I though at that time absent, was elected and appointed the first Grand Chaplain of the Grand Chapter of Royal Arch Masons in the state of New-York. I had preached with approbation in all the principal cities and towns in the northern and eastern states, viz. Philadelphia, Newark, N. J New-York, Albany and Schenectady; in Hartford, Boston and Providence, and in many other towns and places; but the time was come when I was determined to leave the county of Saratoga. I went there in the year 1791, it was now 1801; my parishes had become very extensive, and my labours, arduous and fatiguing; and after the death of my wife, my house was lonesome, gloomy and desolate. My children were removed where they could be taken care of, and I was afflicted. The Episcopal church in Bradford was vacant, the parish was perfectly unanimous and ardent in their wishes for me to return, and become their rector; my parents were then living there, my brothers and sister, and nu-

merous family connexions were residing in that town ; and the Episcopal church was not so generally known and understood as I wished. At length I informed them that I was determined to leave the county of Saratoga. A meeting was called in Branford, East-Haven, and Northfield, and I was unanimously chosen Rector of their churches, which was communicated to the Rev. Mr. Jarvis, my former antagonist, who had now become Bishop of the Episcopal church in Connecticut. Their choice was approved of by him according to the canons, and sent to me in Ballston, which I laid before the church in that place, and requested a dismission from them. Silence, as if it had been the silence of death, prevailed, and not an eye which did not shed a tear. I was the first minister they ever had, most of them and their children, had been baptized by me ; they had been faithfully instructed in the faith and practice of the gospel, and in the concerns of their souls, and of eternity. They had by me been presented to the Bishop, and received the apostolic rite of confirmation. They had by me been admitted to the holy communion of the Lord's supper ; I had visited them in sickness, instructed them when they were ignorant, comforted them in affliction, committed the dead bodies of their friends and relatives, their parents and children, their husbands or wives, their brothers or sisters, to the awful and silent grave, looking for the general resurrection and the life of the world to come through our Lord Jesus Christ. I had always been as ready to mourn with those who mourned as I was to rejoice with those who did rejoice ; for ten years the sun had never risen upon a happier or more united minister and people ; what I said was not only the voice of a minister, who had a tender regard for their souls, but of a friend, who loved them sincerely. My congregations were very large, and when I went into the pulpit, I had the satisfaction to think that there was not a person present, who would not willingly share their last loaf with me. After a long time of silence, old Mr. Bettys, the senior warden, with a heart ready to break, his eyes gushing out with tears, and with a faultering voice, rose and said, Mr. Rogers, why do you wish to leave us ? there is not a person in any of your parishes, who would no

gladly carry you in his arms, if it were necessary; we all respect you, and have always been glad to do every thing in our power for your comfort. The death of your excellent wife, we all mourn, but it could not be prevented. Is it any thing which we have done, or which we have left undone, that induces you to wish to leave us? I replied, that it was not; but that I was in affliction, and wished to return to my parents and to the place of my nativity; that I thought the religious situation of Connecticut was such, as offered an opportunity of doing much good, and that I would endeavor not to leave them destitute of a minister, but would obtain some worthy person to take my place with them; that I had lived to see every Presbyterian minister dismissed from that county, while I had been there, viz. Mr. Skenk, from Ballston, Mr. Riply, from Ballston, castline, Mr. Sill, from Milton, Mr. Sturges, from Charlton, Mr. Linsly, from Galway, Mr. Close, from Waterford, Mr. Campbell, from Stillwater, Mr. Condict, from Stillwater hill, Mr. Smith, from Saratoga, &c. That the Episcopal church in that county had increased far beyond any example in that state; that they had, within a few years, built four new and elegant houses for public worship; that in some places the meeting-houses were used as places of worship for Episcopalians; that from 14 families they had increased to about 4000 souls, and were now in a situation to settle ministers among them, and I thought I could do more good, and it would be more for my comfort to return to Connecticut, and now wished to be dismissed. Judge Walton, and others spoke against it, but in very affectionate terms, and the meeting was dismissed without so much as one voice or vote in favor of my request, and it was the only request which I had ever made of them which was not granted.

In the month of February, 1801. I called a meeting of all the wardens and vestrymen, of all the Episcopal churches in the county of Saratoga, and in the northern part of the state of New-York, and invited the neighboring ministers to attend. At this meeting I laid before them an application made to the Episcopal churches in Ballston and Milton, for my dismission, that I might settle in Branford; also the vote for the settlement of me in that place, with the Bishop's consent; and stat-

ed my request, that if I had been to them a faithful minister, and had deserved well from them, they would no longer object to my happiness, in not granting me a dismission. And I then engaged, that if they would grant my request, I would not leave them, until I had obtained some one to take my place; and that an answer was due from them to the church in Branford. Whereupon Judge Walton drew up the following resolution, which was passed, and given to me, and also a copy was sent by mail to the church in Branford, viz.

"*At a meeting of the Rectors, Church Wardens and Vestrymen of the Episcopal Church in the Northern part of the State of New-York, by adjournment, held in the church in Ballston, February 3d*, 1801.

"Whereas application has been made to the church wardens and vestrymen of the Episcopal churches of Ballston and Milton, from the Episcopal society of Branford, in Connecticut, requesting that they would permit the Rev. Mr. Rogers to leave the said churches, of which he is now Rector, that he might settle in Branford, the place of his nativity. And whereas, the said church wardens and vestrymen having taken the subject into serious consideration, think that the removal of Mr. Rogers from their churches, would be attended with very great inconveniences to the same, particularly as it is much to be feared that another clergyman cannot be obtained, who could unite the affections and the respect of the said congregations, in an equal degree with the Rev. Mr. Rogers. They cannot reflect on the departure of the Rev. Mr. Rogers from among them, without sincere sorrow, as they can scarcely hope to find a person endued with sufficient activity, to support the churches which have been established by the unremitted exertions of their present Rector, nor can they expect to meet with a man who can so well resist the constant opposition which is made to the blessed Episcopal church. But as the change of situation may be conducive to the happiness and welfare of Mr. Rogers, and as it would be improper and unbecoming, in the highest degree, to obstruct the interest and wishes of a rector, who has so well deserved from the said congregations—

Therefore resolved, That in case the Rev. Ammi Rogers should deem it expedient to leave the said churches, he has (though reluctantly.) the approbation of the said church wardens and vestrymen ; but in case he can remain with the said churches, without doing too great injury to his interest and happiness, they would gladly afford him every countenance and support, which they have hitherto given him.

HENRY WALTON, *Secretary*.

Resolved, That Henry Walton be a committe to transmit a copy of the foregoing resolution, to the Episcopal society in Branford, in answer to their application referred to in said resolution.

HENRY WALTON, *Secretary*.

CHAPTER IV.

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH CONTINUED.

I remained in Ballston, and preached in my parishes as usual, until Whit-Sunday, June 24th, 1801 ; when I administered the sacrament, preached a farewell sermon, and as their minister, bid them an affectionate adieu. I had then during the time of my ministry, administered 1542 baptisms; the name and age of each had been returned to the bishop of New York, at the annual convention ; and are on the records of the church in Ballston. I had admitted more than 400 persons, in the county of Saratoga, to the holy communion, besides those in other places. I had joined more than 200 persons in marriage, and had in the whole, attended more than 100 funerals. I had been to Bishop Jarvis in person, and stated my intention of coming in that state, and settling there. I had been to bishop Provoost, and obtained letters permissory for Bishop Jarvis to ordain the Rev. Mr. Thatcher, for the purpose of coming to Ballston, that I might settle in Branford. This was known and understood to be the agreement, and for this purpose Mr. Thatcher was ordained a priest by

Bishop Jarvis, moved into my house, and on my farm, and took possession of my parishes, and then, and not till then. I set off for Branford. On my way to New-York I was obstructed by contrary winds, and went on shore at Catskill, where I staid ten days, performed divine service and preached there almost every day, sometimes twice and three times in a day, and gathered a large congregation. I afterwards returned and assisted them in becoming a body corporate, which has remained and prospered there to this day. A very handsome salary was offered me to stay and settle there; and application was made by them to the church in Branford, for that purpose, but was rejected.

In the month of August, 1801, I arrived in Branford, and took charge of the church in that place, in East Haven, in Northford, and in Wallingford, without a dissenting voice or vote—all were pleased, all were happy. The congregations immediately arose into life and were greatly increased; many within a short time, in each parish, became impressed with a deep sense of the importance of religion and joined the communion. Many, who had hitherto neglected it, furnished themselves and their families with books of Common Prayer, and joined heartily and aloud in the worship of God, as performed in the Episcopal church: many, who had never done it before, now signed off from the Presbyterians, so called, and paid their taxes to the Episcopal church; and the prospect of piety, of increase, and of prosperity, was never fairer. I appeal to every person, who then belonged to these parishes, for the truth of what I say: but at this time party politics and party religion ran very high in Connecticut.

At a convention of the bishop and clergy of that state, in the city of Hartford, I arose and said:

Mr. President—For many years I have thought, that to establish religion by force of civil law, was not conducive to genuine piety and to the real prosperity of the Redeemer's kingdom here on earth. It is, in my opinion, wrong, essentially wrong, to compel people by force of law, to support that which they do not believe to be true; and civil or military force exercised in matters of religion has always eventuated in the oppression, in the distress, and in the destruction of mankind. In proof, shall I call to your view the first crusade under Peter the hermit. Do I see one million one hundred thousand of the human race cruelly murdered and slain. The history of the whole church evinces the truth

of what I say. What was it but a union of church and state, that is, investing the church with civil power, supported by military force, that introduced and established Popery in Europe, Mahometanism in Asia, and something almost as bad in New-England. A union of church and state is like uniting fire and water, Heaven and earth, God and mammon. It is this which has established the INQUISITION of Spain, and elsewhere. It is this which has caused so much oppression and distress in England, Ireland, and Scotland. It was this which murdered the Quakers in Salem, in Massachusetts; tied Roger Williams, and his friends, to the tail ends of ox carts, and whipped them and the Baptists, out of Boston. It was this which has fined and imprisoned hundreds of our fellow citizens in Connecticut, because they would not, or could not, pay money to support that which they did not believe to be true; and now, Sir, at this very time, 1802, no one can be an Episcopalian, unless he will go to the dominant party, put off his hat, make a bow, and humbly ask them to take a certificate, and permit him to become a conscientious dissenter, otherwise he must be taxed by them. I there fore MOVE,

That the Bishop and Clergy, and all the members of the Episcopal church in Connecticut, unite with the republicans, and vote for Col. Ephraim Kirby, of Litchfield, to be governor, (he was for many years held up for Governor in opposition to John Cotton Smith,) he is a worthy man, a well informed Churchman, a true friend to the equal civil and religious rights and priviliges of all mankind, and he would, without doubt, use his best endeavors to have those offensive laws repealed, which give to one sect or party a superiority, and which compel people by law to support them whether they believe their religion or not.

At this the bishop and some of the clergy were very much displeased; and *this* has been the cause of persecution, of slander and abuse, of civil prosecution, of distress, of imprisonment, of disgrace, and ruin to myself, to my children and friends.

In the first place, I was refused a seat in the convention of the Episcopal church in Connecticut, without hearing or trial on the ground that I did not belong to that state; which if true, was directly contrary to the canons of the church. To the next Freeman's meeting, Bishop Jarvis, at the age of about 70, forgetting his station, the honor of the church, and the good of religion, went, took the freeman's oath, joined the federal party, and voted against Col Kirby, and all others of his own communion if they happened to be on the re-

publican interest. At this I felt myself and the church insulted and abused, and thought it my duty to attend to my own parishes, and have but little to do with any thing thing else. The churches in my care prospered exceedingly. Their house of worship in Branford was completely repaired and finished. The church in East-Haven was also repaired and finished. The church in Northford, which had remained ever since before the revolutionary war in a state of decay, was now repaired and finished. The church in Wallingford, at this time, sent to Boston and purchased an excellent organ. In Durham, where the service of the church had never been performed until I went there, about 80 of the taxable inhabitants certificated and joined the Episcopal church under my care ; they had procured books of common prayer, and performed the service remarkably well. But this prosperity only excited jealousy and opposition in the minds of those who ought to have befriended me. Bishop Jarvis visited them, and without their knowledge, placed the Rev. Mr. Merriam there, as their officiating minister, whereby I was precluded preaching there without his consent. No sooner was this known, than a meeting was called and he was dismissed. During this time, means were used to divide my parishes, by exciting distrust and opposition in the minds of my hearers, and by giving the Presbyterian federal party to understand that I was not in good standing. I and my people claimed that I was in good standing ; and that the opposition to me was an infringement upon the established order of the church, and that it was occasioned by presbyterian federal politics. A petition from the church in Branford, in East-Haven, in Northford, in Wallingford, and in Durham, was presented to the convention of the Episcopal church of Connecticut, convened in Danbury, in June, 1803 ; and another petition signed by the Rev. Dr. Mansfield of Derby, the Rev. Mr. Tyler of Norwich, the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee of East-Haddam, the Rev. Mr. Todd of Huntington, the Rev. Mr. Miles of Chatham, and the Rev. Mr. Warren of Middletown, was presented to the same convention, in which they also stated their knowledge of me, of my character and standing in the church, of the union and uncommon prosperity of the churches in my care, and prayed the bishop and clergy to be

reconciled to me, or to bring forward their accusations, if any they had. In answer to which, the bishop arose, and standing within the rails of the altar, and near the communion table, in the church in Danbury, and as president of the convention in 1803, declared and said, "WE (meaning the bishop and clergy) *have nothing against Mr. Rogers, we acknowledge his character and his authority to be good. and on receiving a single line from the Bishop of New-York, we would receive him with open arms.*" The whole controversy is now brought to a single point, and that a mere matter of civility or etiquette, *a single line from the Bishop of N. York* See the proof.

I, Samuel J. Andrews, of Derby, in the county of New-Haven, and state of Connecticut, of lawful age, do testify and say, that I was at the convention of the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity of the Episcopal church, holden at Danbury in June last; that in said convention I heard the Bishop, while acting as president of the same, declare that we, meaning the bishop and clergy, have nothing against Mr. Rogers; we acknowledge his authority and character to be good; and that on receiving a single line from the bishop of New York, we would receive him with open arms, or words to that effect. And further saith not. SAMUEL J. ANDREWS.

New-Haven County, ss. Derby, Jan. 5th, 1804.

Personally appeared Samuel J. Andrews, who hath subscribed the foregoing affidavit, and made solemn oath that the same contains the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as relative to the subject matter thereof. Before me, JOSIAH DUDLEY, *Justice of the Peace.*

I hereby certify, that I was a delegate in the convention holden in Danbury, in June, 1803, and am personally knowing, that the facts stated in the foregoing affidavit of Samuel J. Andrews, are correct and true. JOSIAH DUDLEY.

Here is a public and official assurance given by bishop Jarvis, in behalf of himself and clergy, given as president of the convention of the state, and solemnly given at the communion table, that my authority and my character were good; and a solemn pledge, that, on receiving a single line from the Bishop of New-York, (my republicanism notwithstanding.) he would receive me into the convention with open arms; but

it is supposed that he had sent to his good friend, Dr. Beach, to prevent that line. This requirement was a total departure from the established order of the Episcopal church—it was what, at that time, had never been required of any other clergyman. LETTERS OF ORDERS, which I had, were always sufficient vouchers of a clergyman's character and standing, until he had been regularly impeached and tried: but here was nothing to be tried for. *My character and authority were good and there was nothing against me.* I was not a stranger; I was settled by the unanimous vote of the parishes in the towns and neighborhood where I was born and brought up, and where I had been recommended to be ordained at first. But unreasonable, unconstitutional, and uncanonical as the demand was, for peace sake, my friends were determined to comply with it; and accordingly the Rev. Dr. Mansfield and the Rev. Ambrose Todd wrote to the Bishop of New-York, and received from him the following line, viz.

To the Rev. Richard Mansfield, D. D. Derby, Conn.

New-York, June 13th 1803.

REV. SIR—

In compliance with the request contained in a letter which I lately received from you and the Rev. Mr. Todd, I have to observe, that during the residence of Mr. Rogers in the state of New-York, this diocess was under the direction of my predecessor, Dr. Provoost—*that I never heard Bishop Provoost express any sentiment of disapprobation with regard to Mr. Rogers; nor was there at any time or on any occasion, a complaint brought up against him before the convention of the church in this state.* With great respect, I remain, Rev. Sir, your faithful friend and servant, BENJAMIN MOORE.

This line was presented to Bishop Jarvis in New-Haven, by me, in presence of a committee of the church in Branford, East-Haven, Northford, Wallingford, and Durham, and was by him (his public and official promise notwithstanding) rejected—he said, on the ground that there was no communication from the standing committee of the church in that state; but it was really because I was opposed to a union of church and state. I was now determined to meet him on his own ground, and for that purpose, went into the state of New-

York, and obtained the following certificate from the standing committee of the church there, viz.

To the Right Reverend the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocess of Connecticut, or any other whom it may concern.

This may certify, that the Rev. Ammi Rogers was considered as a regular ordained minister of the protestant Episcopal church, in the state of New-York, and that he was constantly a member of the Convention of this state during his residence here, and in good standing, and that no complaint was at any time brought against him. Dated Sept. 27, 1803.

Signed,

THEODOSIUS BARTOW, Rector of Trinity church, N. Roch.
ELIAS COOPER, Rector of St. John's church, Yonkers.
JOHN CHARLTON, Member of the Standing Committee of the Convention of the Church in New-York.
MATTHEW CLARKSON, do.
WILLIAM OGDEN, do.
RICHARD HARRISON, do.

The foregoing line from the bishop of New-York, and the foregoing certificate from the standing committee of the church in that state, were presented to bishop Jarvis in Derby, by Josiah Dudley, Esq. who was a member of the convention in the state of Connecticut, and were by bishop Jarvis rejected, on the pretended ground that the line from the bishop of New-York was not official. Then I went again to New-York, and obtained the following official line from the bishop of New-York.

"To the Right Rev. Abraham Jarvis, D. D. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of Connecticut.

"I do hereby certify, that the Rev. Ammi Rogers left the state of New-York before my consecration to the office of a bishop, and consequently was never placed under my jurisdiction; that during the time of his residence in this diocess, he constantly attended the conventions of the church, and that in those conventions no complaint was ever preferred against him, nor did he at any time, or on any occasion fall under the censure of the ecclesiastical authority.

BENJAMIN MOORE, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal
January 17th, 1804. Church in the state of New-York.

The foregoing official line was presented to bishop Jarvis by capt. Nathaniel Webb of Stamford, and what could he require more? his word and honor as bishop, and as president of the Episcopal church in Connecticut were pledged; the honor of the whole church in the state was pledged, but, alas! alas! he now throws off the mask—he breaks through all former engagements, and declares, "*that a man who will make religion not only the servant, but the very scullion of a political faction*, (meaning the republicans.) *who are endeavoring to root all religion and authority out of the state, I am determined to have nothing to do with.*" He himself had made religion not only the servant, but the very scullion of the Presbyterian federal party, who were rising against the measures of our general government, and endeavoring to preserve a religious establishment in Connecticut, which I sincerely believe to be inconsistent with the equal rights of other denominations.

On the very next week after bishop Jarvis received the foregoing line from the bishop of New-York, he got some of the clergy, who were of his party, together in Litchfield, and in the night, without granting a hearing or trial, and actually without my knowledge, issued and published *a paper, forbidding me to preach in Connecticut.* Against this *paper* I issued and published a solemn PROTEST, and declared it to be without authority, and of no force, because it was issued without the previous steps required by the authority of God's word, and the constitution and canons of the Episcopal church to which I belonged; *because it was a violation of his most solemn vows of office*, upon the condition of which he was ordained and made a bishop; because to issue a paper against any man without hearing or trial, and actually without his knowledge, was a violation of all civil and religious compact, was disgraceful to his office, was cruel, tyrannical, and oppressive in the highest degree—and because the paper issued by bishop Jarvis against me, was a manifest and shameful violation of his word, and solemn assurance given to me, and to my people, and to the world, as bishop of the state, and as president of the convention of the church, in Danbury, in 1803. On the same grounds, the wardens and vestry, and ninety-one of

the members of the church in Stamford, issued and published their solemn protest against the paper of bishop Jarvis issued against me, and declared it without authority and void. On the same grounds, the church in Branford, in East Haven, in Northford, and in many other places issued and published their solemn protest against the said paper issued against me, and declared it wholly without authority and void.

At this time, I had removed from Branford to Stamford, and had, by the unanimous vote of that parish, become their minister. And here I make a solemn appeal to the conscience of every person who had lived under my ministry in the state of Connecticut, or of New York: have I not diligently read and expounded the holy scriptures of the old and new testament, as opportunity offered? have I not endeavoured to fashion my own life and others, according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make myself a wholesome example to his flock? have I not always reverently obeyed my bishop in all things which were according to the authority of God's word, and the canons of the church, and submitted myself to his godly judgment, founded on the same? have I not faithfully endeavoured to banish and drive away from the church all erroneous and strange doctrines which were contrary to God's word? have I not been diligent in prayers, in reading the holy scriptures, and studying the same, and in administering the sacraments, laying aside the study of the world and of the flesh? have I not endeavoured to set forward quietness, peace, and love among all christian people, and especially among those who were committed to my charge? and were your congregations ever larger, were the people ever more edified, were your parishes ever more prosperous, than while in my care? and where is the person, man or woman, who will say that to them, and in their presence, I have not conducted like a gentleman and a christian? even the false witnesses themselves, on whose account I have suffered imprisonment, and the loss of all things, have constantly declared my innocence, except while under the influence of my personal, political, and religious enemies.

"O, Lord Jesus Christ, who at thy first coming didst send thy messenger to prepare thy way before thee, grant that the

ministers and stewards of thy holy mysteries, may likewise so prepare and make ready thy way, by turning the hearts of the disobedient unto the wisdon of the just, that at thy second coming to judge the world, we may be found acceptable in thy sight ; and grant, O merciful father, that thy people may both perceive and know what things they ought to do, and also that they may have grace and power faithfully to fulfil the same, through Jesus Christ our Lord.—Amen."

Hear me Lord Jesus, not according to the imperfections of my own petitions, but according to the full meaning of that perfect form of words, which thou thyself in great mercy hast taught and expressly commanded, that when we did pray, we should say,

Our Father who art in heaven, &c.

CHAPTER V.

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH CONTINUED.

From the aforesaid paper, issued and published against me by bishop Jarvis, I appealed to the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, assembled in the city of New York, 1804, by way of Petition, and after stating my case, prayed them to decide, 1st, to which state I did canonically belong : 2d, that a paper, issued and published by Bishop Jarvis, against me, without hearing or trial, and wholly without my knowledge ; contrary to the authority of God's word and the established order of the Episcopal church ; inconsistent with his most solemn vows of office, and in violation of his word and honor, publicly pledged as bishop, and as president of the Convention of the Church in Connecticut, might be recalled ; and 3d, that if any one had whereof to accuse me, I might be served with a copy of all and every charge, together with the proof, and that I might have a reasonable time to prepare and defend myself—meaning according to the canons of the church in that state to which they should decide I belonged.

Bishop Jarvis was a member of this House of Bishops, and a judge in his own case; common delicacy would have induced him to withdraw, but he did not. The clerical delegates from Connecticut were admitted to a hearing, and I was called in. They stated that I had called two conventions in Connecticut, one in Wallingford, and one in Branford, and that I had invited some of the leading democrats in Connecticut to attend, and was endeavouring to encourage democracy and to oppose the Bishop. I denied that I had ever called any convention in Connecticut, other than a meeting of the people in my own particular care; or that I ever had used any undue influence in politics, and that I was so far from opposing the Bishop, that I had for the peace of the church, obtained documents from New-York, such as had never been required from any other clergyman, such as he was not authorised by any canon of the church to require, and such as the bishop and committee of New York were not authorized to give. They then brought on the matter respecting Mr. Perry's certificate, see page 19. This certificate was taken from among my papers in Derby, the year before, without my knowledge or consent, and now they denied that there ever was such a paper. I remonstrated against any trial, except in the state to which I did belong, and according to the canons. I remonstrated against calling that up against me as a PRIEST which took place before I was a Deacon; against permitting a matter to remain 12 or 14 years which was censurable, and then after my witnesses were dead, and when it was impossible to bring forward any living testimony, to bring it up against me, that it was hard, it was unjust: besides the matter had been fully inquired into in the time of it, by bishop Provoost, who was the proper authority, and was dismissed by him as unworthy of notice. Bishop Jarvis handed to the delegates who were present from Connecticut, a number of papers, among which was a letter from Samuel Woodruff, Esq. and they laid them before the House of Bishops. *I requested counsel and was refused*—the House adjourned. At evening I called and requested to see some of the papers which were handed in against me; whereupon they "*resolved that nothing shall be done in the business except in the presence*

of both parties." I then addressed a letter to the Right Rev. Bishop White, President of the House of Bishops in New-York, in Sept. 1814, and objected to any decision or determination of the said House of Bishops relative to me, any farther forth than as it respected the diocess to which I did canonically belong, that I might meet the charges, if any there were, according to the constitution and canons of the church; and then immediately left the city and state of New York. After I was gone, *and when both parties were not present*, they formed and published an opinion founded on falsehood and misrepresentation, relative to that certificate and my conduct in Connecticut, which was represented as highly dishonorable; but at the same time decided on the first point, that I was a a clergyman not of New York, but properly of Connecticut, and that it was to them that I was *exclusively* amenable. On the 2d point, as astonishing as it may seem, they approved of the conduct of Bishop Jarvis in Connecticut, i. e. *I suppose he approved of his own doings.* On the 3d point, they directed documents to be furnished to both parties, as a ground of trial in Connecticut.

The very next month I sent in my petition to the bishop and clergy of Connecticut, praying for a trial according to to the canons of the church, on what they had alledged against me in New York; and at the same time I sent in articles of complaint on the uncanonical, immoral and wicked conduct of Bishop Jarvis, and pledged myself to prove them, if they would give me an opportunity. My petition was not acted on, and Bishop Jarvis, again without hearing or trial, and without my knowledge, issued and published another *paper*, founded on the misrepresentations which he himself and his party had made to the House of Bishops in New York, and which they had referred to Connecticut for trial. My articles of complaint remain with the Secretary to this day, untried and uninvestigated.

Soon after this last paper of Bishop Jarvis was published, a meeting of the Episcopal Society of St. John's church, in Stamford, was legally warned, to call and settle a minister; and by a vote of this meeting I was called, received, and ac-

knowledged to be the regular, ordained, and settled minister and rector of St. John's church in Stamford, and they agreed to pay me at the rate of $558 a year, during my natural life, any order, determination, or decree of the bishop and clergy to the contrary notwithstanding. About one hundred lawful voters of that parish were in favour of this vote, and 7 against it. These 7, except one, were near relations and family connexions of Bishop Jarvis; they claimed that they, seven, were the society, and owned the church and property; and that the hundred had, by their vote *ipso facto* ceased to be churchmen, and had forfeited all right and title to the church and property.

On this ground they sued me at law, for trespass, in going into their church and preaching, after the bishop had forbid me. On trial I claimed that the bishop had no authority to forbid any clergyman, or to silence or degrade him. It was then incumbent on the plaintiff to shew what authority the bishop had; and to do this the bishop's vows of office, on condition of which he was made a bishop, and the constitution and canons of the church, must be introduced in the court.

Before any person can be made a bishop in the United States, he must make this promise, viz. "*In the name of God, Amen.*" I, A—— J—— "chosen bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church" (in Connecticut, or whatever state it may be,) "do promise conformity and obedience to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America: So help me God through Jesus Christ."

Among other things, he promises, "that he will, by the help of God, diligently exercise such discipline as the authority of God's word, and by the order" (that is, by the constitution and canons) "of this church is committed to him." In confirmation of this oath and promise, he takes the sacrament of the Lords supper, and on these conditions with others, he is ordained and made a bishop:—(*see the consecration of bishops in the book of Common Prayer.*) By this the bishop has no authority to exercise any discipline, to forbid, silence, degrade, or even to censure any

clergyman without the previous steps required by the authority of God's word, and the constitution and canons of the Episcopal church. The authority of God's word is, "if thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone," (Matth. 18th chapter); "Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses." (Tim. 5th chapter.)

The constitution of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States—"Article 6th. In every state the mode of trying clergymen shall be instituted by the convention of the church therein," &c. "Article 4th, Every bishop of this church shall confine the exercise of his Episcopal office to his own proper diocess or district."

Canons made by the convention of the Episcopal church in Connecticut, on the first Wednesday in June, 1798, in conformity to the 6th article of the constitution of the Episcopal church in the United States.

Canon 3d. *Offences for which a clergyman may be brought to trial in Connecticut*—Disorderly and immoral conduct, neglect of duty, disregarding the constitution and canons of the church, or disseminating or countenancing opinions which are contrary to its doctrines, are offences for which a clergyman may be brought to trial.

Canon 4th. *The mode of trying a clergyman in Connecticut.*—If a minister offend in any of these respects, application in writing, signed by his accusers, shall be sent in the first instance to the standing committee, and if it appears to them that there is ground for the charge, they shall report thereupon to the bishop, who shall call a convention of his clergy, not less than seven, and after a *full hearing, and fair trial and examination*, the bishop with the advice of the clergy present, shall pronounce sentence against him.

BEFORE THE HON. JUDGE DAVENPORT, IN CONNECTICUT.

Nathaniel Webb and Others *vs.* Ammi Rogers.

This is an action of trespass, in which the plaintiffs demand of the defendant, damage and their cost, for going into their church in Stamford, in Connecticut, and performing ministerial duties, after he was degraded and forbidden by the bishop.

"And the defendant did offer then to prove *in court*, by the Rev. Ashbel Baldwin, who had long been, and at and long before the time of rendering said sentence of degradation, was and still is secretary of the convention of the diocess of this state, one of the standing committee thereof--that no application in writing was ever made to the said standing committee, against or concerning the said Ammi Rogers; and that no report had ever been made against said Rogers by any standing committee, as is required in said 4th Canon; and that no trial of said Rogers was ever had by any convention of clergy in this state. The defendant claimed that the said testimony of said Baldwin was admissible to shew *that said bishop had no power to degrade the defendant at the time of issuing and pronouncing the same.* To which the plaintiffs did object, on the ground that the said bishop and clergy are a court ecclesiastical, with competent power and authority; and they only having jurisdiction to try, condemn and degrade any of the clergy belonging to the diocess of Connecticut, and that their decision is final and cannot be inquired into by the courts of law of civil jurisdiction; which testimony of said Baldwin was adjudged by this court to be admissible—and the same was heard, and went to prove, and the court found the facts from him claimed by the defendant to be *true*"— ["and the said Rogers is not silenced nor degraded, but has full power and authority to go into the church, to preach, to baptize, to administer the sacrament, to marry, and to perform all the duties pertaining to his office as a priest in full orders and in good standing in the Protestant Episcopal church."]

The foregoing is truly extracted from the bill of exceptions, [before the superior court in Fairfield county] in the case of Nathaniel Webb and others *vs.* Ammi Rogers, dated May 28th, 1805. Examined by me,

EBENEZER DAVENPORT, Justice of the Peace."

"The bishop's party sued me nine times for this same trespass, and there was seldom a day, for almost eight years, when I was not harrassed, persecuted, and distressed with these vexatious and unreasonable law suits. I was attached in the most spiteful manner, and brought before justices courts,

county courts, superior courts, of courts of error, and in every instance I beat them, and recovered my cost, or they withdrew their suit and paid their own cost. They never did at any time, or on any occasion, recover from me so much as one cent, or prove any thing to my dishonor or disadvantage, though they examined with the most malicious intentions into the most private passages of my whole life. I was obliged to attend court four and six times a year, at a distance of twenty or twenty-five miles, with my lawyers and witnesses, and prepared for trial; and towards the end of the court they would get the case continued or appeal. or withdraw and sue again, or I would beat them. Their object was, without doubt, to run me down, and to run out my property. If the reader ask why was all this hatred, animosity, and contention? I answer, not because I had committed any crime,not because I was not a clergyman in regular and good standing, and in love and friendship with my own people; and the bishop himself had acknowledged my character and authority to be good, (see page 39); but I was a republican in principle, I was opposed to a union of church and state—I was opposed to compelling people by force of law to support that which they did not believe to be true, or to acknowledge themselves dissenters from those who are dissenters themselves. In Connecticut every settled congregational presbyterian minister can send his collector and take any man's horse from under him, or his oxen, or cows, or hogs, or any property which he possesses, unless he has signed off, and can sell it at the post without suing him,*or granting him a hearing*. I have known themtake even a man's Bible, and sell it at the post to pay the minister's tax. I have known Episcopalians, Baptists and others, actually locked up and confined in a filthy disgraceful jail, in Connecticut, merely because they would not, or could not in conscience pay their money to support that which they did not believe to be true. I could mention the persons, times and places. but I presume that no one acquainted in Connecticut will deny the fact. Can it then be any wonder if these same people should join with Bishop Jarvis, and cause me to be sued nine times for the same pretended trespass. keep me eight years in law, and finally on the charge of crimes which

never were committed, disgrace, imprison, and ruin me and my innocent children and friends.

NATHANIEL WEBB AND OTHERS vs. AMMI ROGERS.

An extract of the deposition of the Rev. Philo Shelton, before the Superior Court, in Fairfield county, Connecticut.

QUESTION. Are you a member of the standing committee of the Episcopal church in this state, and have you been such for many years last past, and at the time Bishop Jarvis issued his sentences against the defendant.

ANS. Yes.

QUESTION. Was there ever a complaint or application made in writing, signed by accusers, against the defendant, as is required by the 6th article of the general ecclesiastical constitution, and the 4th canon of the Episcopal church in this state. [*See page* 49.]

ANS. No.

QUESTION. Did the standing committee aforesaid, ever report a complaint against or concerning the defendant, as is required by the aforesaid constitution and canons?

ANS. No.

QUESTION. Did Bishop Jarvis ever call a convention of the clergy on account of the defendant, and grant him, the said defendant, a full hearing and fair trial, according to the aforesaid constitution and canons?

ANS. No.

QUESTION. Did not the house of bishops in New-York, September, 1804, determine that the defendant was *exclusively* amenable to the authority of the Episcopal church in Connecticut.

ANS. YES.

I certify that the foregoing is a true extract of the deposition of the Rev. Philo Shelton, before the superior court in Fairfield county, in the year 1806.

DAVID BURR, CLERK OF SAID COURT.

N. B. Look at the Bishop's vows of office—how solemnly did he promise and swear, that he would exercise such discipline as by the authority of God's word and the constitution and canons of this church is committed to him! did he not take

the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, to confirm this oath and promise! and awfully wicked must he be who would destroy the whole order of the church!

NATHANIEL WEBB AND OTHERS *vs.* AMMI ROGERS.

Before the Superior Court of Connecticut in Fairfield County, 1806.

William White D. D. Bishop of the P. E. Church in Pennsylvania, deposeth and saith—That he was a member and president of the House of Bishops in the city of New-York, in September, 1804; That he did not consider the House of Bishops as exercising discipline on Ammi Rogers, when they gave their opinion in his case at that time. That in his opinion it does not come within the province of the House of Bishops to try, judge or in any way condemn a Clergyman who is exclusively amenable to the authority of the Diocess of Connecticut. That he did not consider the House of Bishops as enjoining any duty on Bishop Jarvis, or requiring from him any act, but only as expressing an opinion to be communicated to said Rogers and those clergymen who had appeared against him before the Bishops; that to the best of his recollection the said Rogers did object both in words and in writing to any decision of the house of bishops relative to him any further forth than as it respected the diocess to which he did canonically belong, where he might have time to collect his witnesses and shew the falsity of any charges which had or might be brought against him.

Subscribed and sworn in the city of Phiiadelphia on the 26th of July 1806, before

RICHARD PALMER, *Justice of the Peace.*

Benjamin Moore, D. D. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New-York—Deposeth and saith, That he was a member of the general Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, held in the city of New-York, in the month of September, A. D. 1804. That certain matters were brought before the house of Bishops, for their consideration by the Rev. Ammi Rogers, &c. That in regard to what authority is Mr. Rogers amenable? the house of Bishops were of opinion, that he was *exclusively* amenable to the authority of the Church in Connecticut—and moreover, it appeared to

this deponent to be the wish and intention of the house of Bishops to refer the said Ammi Rogers to the authority of the Church in Connecticut, that he might be proceeded against according to the constitution and canons of the Church, and *that the opinion delivered by the house of Bishops, was not considered by them as judicial, but the case of Mr. Rogers was referred to the authority of the Church in Connecticut* FOR A TRIAL.

BENJAMIN MOORE.

City, County, and State of New-York, ss. July 22, A. D. 1806. Then and there personally appeared Benjamin Moore, the above named deponent, who subscribed and made solemn oath to the foregoing deposition in due form of law, before me.

A. C. VAN SLYKE, *Justice of the Peace.*

Bishop Moore and Bishop White solemnly swear that the case of Mr. Rogers was referred to Connecticut for a trial.—Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Shelton solemnly swear that that trial has never been granted.

To the Rev. Ammi Rogers, Hebron, Tolland county, Connecticut. *Stamford, Jan.* 31, 1818.

REV. SIR—

I received yours of the 14th inst. and now inform you that the conduct of the Rev. Mr. Burhans is still fresh in my memory. He came to the house of Mr. Quintard, where you boarded, with the Rev. Mr. Todd, and I was there, to confer with me, as one of the wardens of the church, for your dismission. I informed them that the parish had never been more united and pleased with any minister than they were with you, that a minister was generally best known by his own parishioners, that if they had any thing against you, they ought to state it in your presence and give you an opportunity of making your defence, and unless they would do this, I should have nothing to do with them. They informed me that bishop Jarvis would not consent to that. You then attacked Mr. Burhans about the certificate of Mr. Perry of Newtown; you asked him how he could inform Mr. Butler that there was no such certificate, that it was all a lie, and a sham, and a forgery, when he had at that very time, the certificate in his own possession concealed, and had acknowledged before the Rev. Dr. Mansfield, and others, that he knew it to be the hand-writing of Mr. Perry; that he knew it as well as he

did his own, and could swear to it. At this Mr. Burhans walked off without making any reply. Mr. Todd remained some time, and said he was sensible that you had been treated with great and cruel injustice; that he was sorry for it, and would do every thing in his power to have it settled. The next morning I was present, when he brought Mr. Burhans to you, at Mr. Quintard's, who then confessed to you, that he had been to blame about that certificate; that he did not blame you for being offended with him; that he had done wrong, and was sorry for it, and asked you to forgive him; that the certificate was yours and you should have it; he had it not with him, but you should have it in a fortnight; that he took it by accident or mistake, and when he spoke to Mr. Butler about it, he did not know that he had it. This I think took place in 1805. [Mr. Quintard, his family, and others, were present.] The certificate not being returned for several months, it was advertised in the newspaper printed in Danbury, and broad hints were given that it would soon be called for by the authority of the state, for that it had been taken from Mr. Rogers in a clandestine and felonious manner, and kept from him three years, and to his great injury. That soon after this advertisement, the said Burhans came to my house with two others, you being out of town at that time, and presented to me the said certificate for you. I told him I should have nothing to do with it; that I did not know the hand-writing, and should give no receipt for it. He said that it was the same certificate which Mr. Perry gave you, that he knew it to be his hand-writing, that he did not take it of his own accord or by mistake, for it was given to him before witnesses to keep, by Mr. Baldwin, and it was done by Bishop Jarvis's order, and he would let me know it. I then received the said certificate from Mr. Burhans, and delivered the same to you. He then having the newspaper in his pocket, containing the advertisement, took it out and demanded from me, if I was the author of that piece signed with my name. I told him the paper would speak for itself, and he might make what use of it he pleased. So we parted; with pleasure to me, for I did not wish to be in company with a man of his profession, who would tell so many different sto-

ries on the same subject, and which would clash so hard. It certainly must be a bad cause which would require such means to support it. It looked so much like lying, which is a thing that I always despise, in any man, but more especially in a clergyman, and it came within my own personal knowledge too, that I never can forget it. Thus I have given you a short but true account of the affair as it took place at that time, and I am, Rev. Sir, with sentiments of great respect, your sincere friend. CARY LEEDS.

Mr. Leeds is a man of large property, of good moral character, has for many years been one of the wardens of the Episcopal church in Stamford, and is as much to be believed as any man in that town. How unjust, how cruel, mean, and dishonorable was it to take that certificate from me without my knowledge or consent, to keep it concealed for three years, deny that there ever was any such certificate, get me disgraced for the want of it, and now call upon the whole Episcopal church and others to support them in their wickedness. Is there a gang of the meanest miscreants on earth, is there a gang of highway robbers, who would treat one of their comrades worse than this? and are not those who would knowingly uphold them as bad as they are!!

After having been sued nine times for the same pretended trespass, and harrassed, persecuted and distressed for almost eight years, I sued Nathaniel Webb and others for distressing me with vexatious and unreasonable law suits, and after a full hearing and a fair trial, and able counsel on both sides, before the Superior Court in Fairfield, in Connecticut, on the 29th day of December, 1809, I recovered a verdict of $600, against them; but this was but a small part of the real money which I had actually paid, besides my time and trouble. The papers were returned and the case was afterwards privately settled.

To the Rev. Tillotson Bronson, D. D. President of the Standing Committee of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut.

Glastenbury, April 17, 1815.

Rev. Sir—

We received yours of the 13th ult. and have noticed the contents. In our first communication to you, we wished to

be unequivocally informed: has there ever been any complaint, hearing, or trial of the Rev. Ammi Rogers, according to the canons of the church in this state or any other? Your answer was NO. and at the same time informed us that Mr. Rogers had applied to the House of Bishops, in 1804, and that he was actually tried, and by them condemned; and considering their vows of office, and the established order and security of the Episcopal church, we could not withhold our astonishment! But on further inquiry we found, that bishop White and Bishop Moore had, each of them, under the solemnity of an oath before a court of law, contradicted your information, and testified that Mr. Rogers had not been tried nor condemned by them, and that they had no cognizance of his case—and we were led to believe that Bishop Jarvis's papers against Mr. Rogers, were a solemn mockery, a farce and an imposition; or that the said bishops had perjured themselves. But to be certain on the subject we wrote to you again, and requested you to inform us: 1st. By what authority did bishop Jarvis issue his papers against Mr. Rogers without hearing or trial, according to the canons of the church, in this state, or any other? 2d. Who has constituted the house of bishops a tribunal to try any clergyman? 3d. Is any clergyman to be considered unworthy or degraded except in consequence of a trial according to the canons of the church in that state to which he belongs? We expected that as a gentleman, as a christian and as president of the standing committee, on whom, you say, it devolves to give the necessary information, you would have informed us; but you have thought proper to shrink from these inquiries. Whether it was because you had not goodness enough to confess and retract, or because you wished us to sanction and carry into effect that which you and we knew to be wrong, we do not know; but this we do know, that you have not answered our inquiries. You say if there has been an error, the House of Bishops are the only proper authority to correct it. This surely must be a mere put off, for you cannot be insensible that he did apply to them in 1803, and that then they and the general convention decided, that he was exclusively amenable to the authority of the church in Con-

necticut; and that by the 6th article of the constitution which secures to every clergyman in the United States the privilege of being tried according to the canons of the church in that state to which he belongs, they had no cognizance of his case. Why then do you refer him to them? But we have written to bishop White on the subject and received his answer, dated Philadelphia, March 8, 1815, in which he says, "When the bishops, during the said convention, went on the business referred to, it was for the purpose of giving their opinion on the question, whether Mr. Rogers belonged to the church in Connecticut, or to that in New-York.—Soon after the convention had arisen, bishop Moore and I were asked, whether we considered what had passed as a trial of Mr. Rogers, *and we both declared we did not*, and there was no other bishop present, except Dr. Parker, who in the mean time has departed this life." Now, Sir, if we compare this with your information to us, what shall we think, what shall we believe, what shall we know? If the whole proceedings against Mr. Rogers have been wholly unauthorized and void, we wish you and the standing committee to declare it; if they have been according to the authority of God's Word, and the constitution and canons of the church; shew us wherein, by referring to chapter and verse, to article and canon. This, as guardians of the church, as gentlemen and as christians, you will not refuse to do. Please to lay this before the standing committee so soon as opportunity will permit, and favor us with their answer, and in so doing you will much oblige your humble servants.

John Cleaver,	Roger Hale,	Alexander Hollester,
James Robinson,	David Robinson,	Jared Goodrich,
Ezra Dayton,	Henry Jones,	Samuel Taylor, 2d.
Gideon Hale,	Daniel Andrews,	

The above named gentlemen were the wardens and vestrymen of the church in Glastenbury, a few miles below the city of Hartford, and are among the first for respectability in that town. Mr. John Cleaver, who was one of the wardens and a very respectable man, took the most unwearied pains to have the clergy come forward with their complaint, if any they had, for my parishes were all perfectly in my favor. The only thing pretended was that certificate of Mr. Perry,

[*See page* 19.] but they dare not bring it into trial, for it took place before I was even a deacon, and it had already been dismissed by bishop Provoost as unworthy of notice: *but was it no crime in them* to take it from me, without my knowledge or consent? was it no crime to keep it concealed for three years, to deny that there ever was any such certificate; while at the same time they had it in their possession, concealed; and taken without my knowledge? was there no crime in all this? Yet they will hang together, and get the people to support them, and to despise me if they can! But their real objection was the motion made in Hartford, 1802. [*See page* 38.] It was because I was opposed to a union of church and state, because I thought it wrong to invest any ecclesiastical tribunal with civil and military power: but it would have been unpopular, and they dare not bring it forward as a complaint. A clergyman is generally best known in his own parish and among his neighbors; and my parishes were perfectly united in me, even the seven who sued me, declared that they had not any thing personally against me, and that if the bishop and clergy were satisfied with me, they should be; but the fact is, I dared to deny, that they had any authority, except according to the constitution and canons of the church.

After Bishop Jarvis had issued his papers against me, and I was settled in Stamford, as before stated; he called a number of his clergy together in that place, and sent to the wardens of the church for the key; they replied that the key was in the possession of the Rev. Ammi Rogers, their rector: that if they wanted it they must apply to him. Bishop Jarvis then addressed a letter to *Mr. Ammi Rogers* in Stamford, directing the key to be given to the bearer. I returned an answer, that I knew no such man in Stamford as *Mr. Ammi Rogers;* that if he wanted the key of the church, he must apply to the proper officer, *with the title of his office.* The key was not given up, and they held their meeting in the school-house, at a few rods distance from the church. At this school-house, Bishop Jarvis himself, the Rev. Mr. Burhans, and some others, had frequent meetings, while the door of the church was shut against them. Their

object appeared to be, to divide the affections of my people, and to carry into effect the bishop's papers, by propagating slander and abusive reports; and in this way to lessen my reputation and influence, at home and abroad, as much as possible. *And if a bishop and clergy shall undertake to destroy a man's character*, no innocence, no virtue, no integrity, can stand before them! After I had recovered a verdict of $500, before the superior court, for vexatious and unreasonable law suits, I left Connecticut, and moved into Greenfield, in the county of Saratoga and state of New-York, where I had formerly been acquainted; and collected a congregation, organized a church, had it incorporated according to law, and was settled there as their rector. I then brought a suit against bishop Jarvis for slander, before the *circuit court* of the United States, to be holden in New-Haven, in Connecticut, in April, 1811. Here I was prepared to support my character and standing, from the town where I was born, from every place where I had resided, and from every parish of which I had the charge. But although I had taken the words of my declaration, in writing, from the mouths of my witnesses, before I brought the suit; yet now, they being in the neighborhood of bishop Jarvis, and of his federal friends, and in my abscence out of the state, they could not be made to remember any thing which he had said against me; I could not prove the words of my declaration, and was obliged, at a great expense, to withdraw my suit. Soon after, bishop Jarvis went into the city of New-York, I pursued him, and there arrested him with a supreme writ for $20,000 damages, in issuing papers against me, without authority, thereby causing me, my children, and friends, to be disgraced, and unjustly distressed; causing me to be harrassed and put at great expense with vexatious and unreasonable law suits; distressing my parishes, breaking up my settlements, &c.

After I had sued bishop Jarvis in 1811, before the supreme court in the state of New-York, I was employed, and took charge of the Episcopal church in Saybrook, Conn. and preached a part of the time in Pleasant Valley in Lime, and remained there until 1813. In April, 1813, my case against bishop Jarvis was brought before the court. The questions

were, 1st, Did the defendent issue papers against the plaintiff? The papers were ready in court to be produced. 2d, Had the defendant any authority, civil or ecclesiastical, to issue and publish those papers in the manner and under the circumstances in which he did? Courts of law of competent jurisdiction in the state of Connecticut, had already decided that he had not. 3d. What is the damage in this case, special and exemplary? While this case was depending, and before a decision was obtained, bishop Jarvis died, and the case died with him. Thus the matter ended so far.

In the year 1808, I went to Baltimore, in the state of Maryland, and presented my petition to the general convention of the Episcopal church, then sitting there, complaining of bishop Jarvis, for issuing and publishing papers against me, without hearing or trial; without my knowledge, and contrary to the canons of the church; and praying to have them revoked and declared void, as they were. Humble petitions from the church in Branford, in East Haven, in Northford, in Wallingford, in Durham, in Woodbridge, in Salem part of Waterbury, in the north society in Derby, in Stamford, in Greenwich, in New Canaan, all in the state of Connecticut: and from the church in Ballston, in Milton, and in Charlton, in the state of New-York, to the same amount; and stating their knowledge and approbation of me and of my character, were also presented to the general convention at the same time. Whereupon it was resolved, that neither the general convention nor any bishop has the cognizance of the conduct of any minister, except in the diocess to which he belongs, and conformably to the canons, by the convention of the church in that diocess, prescribed. This was the amount, if not the very words, of their resolution. But to afford the redress prayed for, the House of Bishops, in their pastoral letter to every member of the Episcopal church in the United States, issued and published at that time, (1808) declared the established principle of the church on this point in page 15 and 16, viz.

"The church has made provision for the degradation of unworthy clergymen. It is for us to suppose that there are none of that description, until the contrary is made known

to us, in our respective places, in the manner prescribed by the canons," [*i. e. neither the Rev. Ammi Rogers nor any other clergyman is to be considered silenced, unworthy, or degraded, until he has had a full hearing and fair trial according to the canons of some particular state or diocess, to which he belongs.*] "and if the contrary to what we wish is in any instance to be found," [*i. e. if Bishop Jarvis has done this thing*] "it lies on you, our clerical and lay brethren, to present *such faulty conduct*, although with due regard to proof, and above all, in a temper which shews the impelling motive, to be the glory of God, and the sanctity of the reputation of his church.

"While we are not conscious of any bias, which under an official call would prevent the conscientious discharge of duty, WE WISH TO BE EXPLICIT IN MAKING KNOWN TO ALL, THAT WE THINK IT DUE TO GOD AND TO HIS CHURCH, TO AVOID WHATEVER MAY SANCTION ASSUMED POWER, however desirable the end to which it may be directed," [*i. e. if Bishop Jarvis, or the House of Bishops themselves, or any bishop or person have, or shall assume, the power of declaring any clergyman silenced or degraded, without the previous steps required by the authority of God's word, and the canons of the church, even where he deserves a severe ecclesiastical censure, that of degradation from the ministry, it is due to God and to his church, to avoid, to oppose and to resist whatever may sanction or carry into effect such assumed power,*] "we have at least as weighty reasons to restrain us from judging without inquiry, and from censuring without evidence of crime; these are ends to which men of impetuous spirits would sometimes draw. But we would rather subject ourselves to the charge of indifference, however little merited, than be the means of establishing precedents, giving to slander an advantage, against which no innocence can be a shield, and leaving to no man a security, either of interest or of reputation," [*i. e. the House of Bishops would rather let the guilty go unpunished, than be the means of establishing precedents of assumed power, in declaring a clergyman unworthy and degraded without hearing or trial according to the canons of the church in that state to which he belongs; for this would be giving to slander an advantage, against which no innocence could be a shield, and it*

would be leaving to no man a security, either of interest or of reputation.] "Although we have no reason to complain that sentiments in contrariety to these prevail among us to any considerable extent," [*i. e. no one but Bishop Jarvis has assumed this power.*] "yet we freely deliver our sentiments on this subject, in order to give us an opportunity of calling on all wise and good men, and we shall not call on them in vain, to aid us in resisting that mischievous spirit, which confounds right and wrong, in judging the character and rights of others.

Signed by order of the House of Bishops in General Convention, at Baltimore, May 23*d* 1818.

WILLIAM WHITE, *Presiding Bishop.*

Attested by JAMES WHITEHEAD, *Secretary.*"

Thus the papers issued against me, by Bishop Jarvis, are WHOLLY REVOKED AND DECLARED VOID by the house of Bishops, the highest ecclesiastical authority in the Episcopal church, in the United States. I am by them virtually declared a clergyman of good standing in the Episcopal church, and the conduct of bishop Jarvis, in regard to me, is reprobated in language of great justice and severity.

State of Connecticut, ss.—*Tolland Co. Hebron, June*, 25, 1818.

We, the undersigned, hereby certify, that we have this day carefully examined and compared *an extract of the minutes* of the House of Bishops, in Baltimore, in the state of Maryland, on the 20th day of May, 1808, which is in body, in signature, and duty, attested in the hand writing of the Rev. James Whitehead, D. D. their secretary—that on the aforesaid careful examination and comparison *with the printed journal* of the said House of Bishops, there are material additions, omissions and alterations in the said printed journal, all to the particular disadvantage of the Rev. Ammi Rogers, viz. the word *this*, page 22, line 14, is altered to *their* determination, and in the next line, the word *properly* is omitted. In the 23d line of the same page the word *censure* is altered into *sentence*, and in the next line the word *now* is omitted, and the words *or attention* are added, &c. entirely altering the meaning. Certified by Andrew Mann, *Justice of Peace*,

Stewart Beebe, *Justice of Peace*,

Payton R. Gilbert, *Justice of Peace.*

Is it no crime to forge and alter the journal of the House of Bishops, and to represent them as saying and doing that to my particular disadvantage which they never did say or do? is there no crime in this? Are the Episcopal clergy calling upon all people to assist them in sanctioning these nefarious doings? and can you support them in doing it, without being as bad as they are? Do you ask, who has done this abominable thing? turn to the journal of the general connection in 1808 and you will see who were the committee for printing the said journal, and they were my particular enemies. Do you ask, why have the bishop and clergy of Connecticut persecuted me, and refused me a seat in their convention? I answer, because they knew assuredly that I would bring these things up against them. To take from me my certificate, the evidence of my innocence, without my knowledge; to misrepresent and falsify the truth, and induce the House of Bishops, in 1804, to do the same; and in 1808 to forge and alter their journal, is certainly worse than for Mr. Davis to forge the truth to contradict a falsehood. *See page* 19.

In the year 1813 I removed from Saybrook and was employed to perform ministerial duties in St. Peter's church in Hebron, in Tolland county, one part of the time. I also collected a congregation, and was employed to preach a part of the time in Jewitt City, a handsome village, which was then a part of the town of Preston, and near Lisbon, but is now a part of the town of Griswold, in New London county. The next year I was employed to preach a part of the time in Poquatanic, which is a handsome village on a bay on the east side of the river Thames, ten miles from New London, on the line between the towns of Groton and Preston. In these parishes and in some other towns in that part of the state, religion and the Episcopal church were blessed and prospered exceedingly under my ministry. The congregations were large, attentive, united, and I believe were happy. The reader is desired to read a letter on this subject from the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee, to the Right Rev. Bishop Hobart, in New-York. The presbyterian clergy in general, and the federal part of the community were much opposed to me, re-

ported many false and foolish stories, and represented me as silenced and degraded, the pastoral letter of the House of Bishops, and the decisions of our courts of law to the contrary notwithstanding. The Rev. Mr. Burhans, the Episcopal minister in Newtown, furnished Elder Amos Reed, near Jewitt City, with Jarvis's papers against me, and endeavoured to embark the Baptists in the controversy. Many of the clergy in the western part of the state, for reasons unknown to me, had determined to carry Jarvis's doings against me into effect; and my opposition to them naturally excited their opposition to me.

CHAPTER VI.

BISHOP HOBART IN CONNECTICUT, &c.

In the year 1816, Bishop Hobart of New-York, was requested by the convention of the Episcopal church in Connecticut, to take charge of their churches, for the present, and to perform Episcopal duties in the state; with this request he complied; and soon after the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee of New-London, and the Rev. Mr. Tyler of Norwich, addressed to him the following letter, viz.

New-London, Oct. 10th, 1816.

Right Reverend Sir,

We deem it a duty which we owe to ourselves and to the church, but more especially to the Bishop, to express our sense of the obligation he has conferred in extending his care to the interest and welfare of the church in this diocess. We should be pleased to attend the convention at New-Haven, with our brethren, if it were practicable, and testify our acknowledgments, and welcome the bishop; but we hope and trust our absence will not be construed into a want of respect, or prevent the Bishop from visiting our churches as early as may be. Our people are looking with anxiety for the time, and we certainly feel as much anxiety for the church as

our western brethren. And while we deem it our duty thus to apologize for our absence, we wish respectfully to suggest our feelings on a subject, in which, from our local situation, we may be supposed to feel a peculiar interest. We are located in the neighborhood of Mr. Rogers, whose standing is not, we presume, unknown to the Bishop. To dictate any mode of proceeding, is far from our intention; but we beg leave to suggest whether something cannot be done that may conciliate the feelings, and produce that unity which is so desirable, and we may say, so absolutely necessary, to the prosperity of the Episcopal church. Mr. Rogers has several churches in our neighbourhood, entirely built up (under the care of superintending Providence) by his own exertions, under all the opposing difficulties which attend him. His parishoners and many other gentlemen, as well clergy as laity, seem to doubt the constitutionality of his trial, [*he never had a trial.*] and the correctness of the sentence of degradation which is said to lie against him; of course the decree has not been regarded by great bodies of people. He is now performing the stated duties of a presbyter in the Episcopal church. His friends say (and we believe with strict propriety, so far as respects the churches in our neighbourhood,) that Mr. Rogers has been exemplary in his conduct, zealous in the discharge of his duty, correct in his doctrines, persevering in the cause of the church; and they most devoutly request that the bishop would advise some method, either by trial or reconciliation, by strict constitutional discipline, or by an indulgence, founded on a wish to conciliate, and a charity which inclines to mercy, where the technical rules of legal administration will permit. And, sir, when we view this unhappy misunderstanding in all its bearings, we cannot but feel a wish that the bishop would, in his wisdom, (for we are satisfied with his zeal for the promotion of the blessed Episcopal church,) devise some method by which this unhappy division may be healed, and the peace, honour and welfare of that communion to which we belong, be preserved and consummated; and the enemies of our most holy faith be deprived of their boastin With sentiments of the most profound

respect and dutiful submission to the direction of our ordinary, we are, Right Reverend Sir, yours, &c.

JOHN TYLER,
Rector of Christ's Church, Norwich.
SOLOMON BLAKESLEE,
Rector of St. James' Church, New-London.

I attended the convention of the Episcopal church in New-Haven, in October, 1816, when I wrote and sent to Bishop Hobart the following letter, viz.

New-Haven. Oct. 15th, 1816.

RIGHT REV, SIR,

After what has passed, with how much reason I can apply to the goodness of your disposition, to your justice, to your mercy, or to the charity of the disciple of him who hath said, "*condemn not and ye shall not be condemned*," the result of this communication will in some measure evince. It was twenty-four years on the 24th day of last June, since I was ordained a DEACON, and it will be twenty two years on the 19th day of this present month, since I was ordained a PRIEST. And in entering this holy and all-important MINISTRY, I did then, and do now, humbly trust and believe that I was inwardly moved by that ever blessed Spirit of God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels. and all just works do proceed; that I was truly called according to the will of God and the canons of the Episcopal church; and I have, as God has enabled me, endeavoured with all faithfulness rightly and truly to administer the doctrines and sacraments of the church of God, and to make myself a wholesome example to the flock of Christ. I have administered, during my ministry, about three thousand baptisms to men, women, and children. I have, upon their credible profession of faith and repentance, and an assurance of their earnest intention, by God's grace, to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways, admitted to the holy communion more than five hundred persons, and administered to them the blessed sacrament of the Lord's supper. [I have administered the sacrament of the Lord's supper to more than eleven hundred different persons.] I have joined about two hundred persons in holy matrimony; and I have

deposited about one hundred and thirty dead bodies of my fellow christians in the silent grave, looking for the general resurrection in the last day, and the life of the world to come, through our Lord Jesus Christ. I am not conscious that I have, in any respect, departed from the doctrine or worship of the Episcopal church, *nor from its discipline.*

My nearest neighbours and parishioners, the wardens, and vestries, and congregations which have been under my particular care, have uniformly and very unanimously declared that I have always been to them a very faithful minister, and a very exemplary man; and that although they have been constantly conversant and well acquainted with me for days, and weeks, and months, and years, yet from their own personal knowledge they had not known, or had reason to believe that I had or would depart from the rules of morality and propriety. This has been the amount of their uniform and very unanimous testimony. I now have about two thousand souls in my ministerial care, and I know no one of them who I think would not give this testimony if called upon. But when I bring my own conscience to the bar of God; when I consider the awful responsibility of my profession; when I compare the inward disposition of my heart, and my outward words and actions with the purity of God and the perfect rule of his word, I feel my own imperfection, I blush at my own unworthiness, I see the want of an atonement, and feel the want of forgiveness. And on a review of the unhappy opposition which Bishop Jarvis and others have raised against me, conscious of my own frailty, and sensible that I, like other men, have been liable to err, I now confess that I have often said and done that which, on reflection, I am sorry for; and now declare, that whereinsoever I have gone astray from my duty, whereinsoever I have done any wrong to any person by word or deed, I do now truly and earnestly repent, I am heartily sorry for it, and am ready and willing to make restitution to the utmost of my power; and I humbly pray them, for God's sake, to forgive me all that is past. And whereinsoever any person has done me any wrong, by word or deed, and I have been greatly abused, greatly misrepresented, greatly injured, and things laid to my charge

which I never knew; I am ready and willing to forgive them from the bottom of my heart, and never more to mention it: and I hereby offer my hand in charity and friendship to all with whom I have had any controversy. I do not ask to be restored to the ministry, for I have never been canonically censured, suspended, silenced or degraded; nor am I absolved from my ordination vows; but I ask for peace and reconciliation, that the beginning of the bishop's government of the church in this state may be like the first day of a new world, where every one is a friend to every one, where all is harmony, all is friendship, and all are pleased, and all are delighted with all. I know that where envy and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work, and I am heartily tired with it. I religiously believe the Episcopal church to be a divine appointment; that it is the general assembly and church of the first born on earth, the medium through which we must become members of the church triumphant in Heaven. In union and communion with this church, I wish and intend, by God's grace, to live and die; and in it I pray God to give me the confidence of a sure and certain faith, the comfort of a reasonable, religious and holy hope; and that I may be in favour with God, and in perfect charity with all the world. In a COURT OF LAW I expect impartial justice, in an ECCLESIASTICAL COUNCIL I expect mercy, peace and reconciliation. You will please to lay this before the clergy this evening or on the first opportunity, and let me know your determination in the case, at Bishop's tavern, in State-street, in New-Haven; and I am, Right Rev'd. Sir, with sentiments of due consideration, your most obedient and very humbe servant,

AMMI ROGERS.

I was not informed whether the foregoing letter and that of the Rev. Messrs. Tyler and Blakeslee were laid before the convention by the bishop or not; but a motion was made by the Rev. Mr. Rayner. of Huntington, to drop all matters in regard to me, and that I should be received as a member of that convention. This was advocated by most of the clergy and laity from the eastern part of the state—and opposed by the Rev. Mr. Burhans, Burrage Beach, and Asa Chapman, now Judge Chapman. This last had been employed as coun-

sel in some, if not all, the suits against me, for seven years, in Fairfield county. Though educated at the same college and at the same time, he had now become my personal, political, and religious enemy; at this time he volunteered his services, and I was informed discovered great zeal and animation against me; and by his influence, and that of other federals, the motion was lost by a very small majority. Could anything be more arbitrary, tyrannical and oppressive, than to deprive a clergyman of his rights and privileges, without hearing or trial, according to the canons of the church, in any state, in the face and eyes of the pastoral letter of the House of Bishops, and the solemn decisions of our courts of law; and to refuse all overtures of mercy, peace, and reconciliation? Is not this persecution? But this was only the beginning of that dreadful plot, by which I have since suffered two years imprisonment, and the loss of all worldly comforts.

In the year 1817, the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee, by the direction of Bishop Hobart, visited all my parishes, performed divine service with them, preached to them, and gave them public notice that the said bishop would himself, within a few days, visit them in person; that he would perform divine service, preach, confirm, and administer the holy communion to them, and desired them to prepare themselves accordingly. Soon after his return he wrote, and sent the following letter, viz.

From the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee of New-London, to the Right Rev. Bishop Hobart, in New-York.

New-London, July 14th, 1817.

RIGHT REV. AND DEAR SIR,

Agreeable to your request, I have made a tour through the north eastern section of this state, and have visited nine parishes, preached and performed service in each of them.—Seven of them are purely the result of Mr. Rogers' labours; the other two were but the ruins of what they once had been. The church in Poquatanic, where I commenced my mission, was collected some fifty or sixty years since, by the Rev. Mr. Punderson, but ruined by untoward events during the revolutionary war, and has never been able, (though occasionally visited by the Rev. Mr. Tyler,) to assume an aspect of respectability. The building was almost demolished, when Mr.

Rogers, about three years since, first visited them. From four to six families were the number of Episcopalians then in the parish, as stated to me by the wardens and vestry. The church has since been rebuilt and finished, with a bell to it, and the number of families now belonging to it are from fifty to sixty;—from three to four hundred usually attend. They speak in the highest terms of the piety, zeal and talents of their minister, and of the perfect harmony and friendship which subsist among them. Here I met Mr. Tyler and Mr. Rogers, who attended me in the services of the day.

From this place I, attended with Mr. Rogers, went to Jewitt City, about nine miles, where the service had never been attended to but by him. Here I found a handsome stone chapel, finished outside, where I met a numerous congregation, who joined devoutly in the service, and performed the responses in an audible and decent manner. The hearts of the good people were warm, and a spontaneous glow of affection told us how ardently they felt the force of that obligation, which, by your permission, had been conferred upon them. I called upon a number of genteel families, who received me with marked respect, and expressed a warmth of attachment highly honourable to the zeal and faithfulness of Mr. Rogers. The prospect of the growth of the church, although affected by the failure of the manufacturing interest in this place, is, however, very flattering; and the pleasure they felt in being thus noticed, led them to say the village had not seen so happy a day for five years. We left the village that evening and proceeded about three miles, where we were entertained with hospitality and kindness.

Early on Tuesday morning we drove about ten miles, to Mr. Cleaveland's, in Canterbury, where I performed service to an attentive and respectable audience, ardent in the cause of the church, and dispassionate in their inquiries.

From thence we drove to Hampton, about six miles, and were received with equal civility. I performed service at the house of Mr. Litchfield, convenient for a private house; the congregation from two to three hundred, the responses audible, and the attention warm and animated.

From this we proceeded to Stafford, about twenty-five miles, where I performed service in the afternoon, having but one service on that day. The politeness with which we were received by all the respectable inhabitants, together with their devout attendance on the service of the day, declared plainly how ardent their feelings were in favour of the church; their gratitude was loud, their acknowledgements were fervent.

On Thursday morning, after discharging our obligation of politeness to Mr. Johnson, owner of the establishment at the springs in Stafford, for a particular invitation to stop and breakfast with him, we proceeded to Andover, about twenty miles, where I performed service in the meeting-house, (they having lately dismissed their clergyman,) to an audience of several hundreds, devout in their appearance, and orderly in their devotions. Expressions of approbation in favour of the Episcopal worship were almost universal; a handsome repast was provided by Esquire House.

In the afternoon we rode about six miles to Columbia, where I performed service in the meeting house to an attentive and respectful audience, they having likewise lately dismissed their minister.

On Friday forenoon I performed service in Bolton, about eight miles, in a house purchased by Episcopalians, and fitted up for a place of stated worship. In this place there has been a warm opposition to the church. Few attended beside their own members. They appeared like a little band, girt with armour, supporting the cross, and bearing the standard of their blessed Master. They performed the service with a devotion and ardor that would warm the coldest heart, and inspire the dumbest tongue. We dined at Doct. White's.

From thence we passed to Hebron, about six miles, where at four o'clock I performed my last service. Here a numerous congregation collected from the scattered ruins of a church founded some sixty or seventy years ago by the Rev. Mr. Peters, but miserably scattered during the revolutionary war, and but barely kept alive until Mr. Rogers took charge of them about four years since; from which it has wonderfully increased in numbers, and many have joined the communion.

On Saturday Mr. Rogers attended me to Colchester, where I took the stage and returned to my family and friends. And sir, when I retrace the circuitous route, of at least one hundred and forty miles, which I performed, every stage is marked with agreeable incidents, and every toil is sweetened with an endearing recollection. If there is any pleasure in conferring an obligation, you, sir, must feel the expression of that gratitude, which animated every heart. Your goodness in authorizing this mission, will long be remembered, as a monument of that charity which delights in doing good.

Here my communication should have ended, but for the pledge which I gave, and an ardent desire which I feel in leaving no interest unessayed, which might tend to promote the interest and prosperity of the church. I have already stated, that these churches have been reared into life by the care and industry of Mr. Rogers, and to speak with caution, they embrace a number of not less than two thousand souls; many of them have received baptism at his hands, have come to the holy communion through his persuasion and influence, and now wait with a hope and expectation of being presented by their own minister to the bishop, that they may receive the apostolic rite of confirmation. This is the only point which involves in it any delicacy. If Mr. Rogers is not possessed of ecclesiastical authority, his administrations are of course void; if he is possessed of authority and *constitutionally* deprived of the exercise, his administration must be equally invalid. But if he has unjustly, that is, WITHOUT A CONSTITUTIONAL AND CANONICAL TRIAL been forbidden the lawful exercise of that authority which he *constitutionally* and rightfully possessed, *can the interdict in any sense affect the right either in the person dispensing, or in the persons receiving the exercise of that power? ! !* It may not be permitted for me to travel over decisions said to be bottomed on legitimate principles, but I should be sorry to find on the records of the church history, precedents by which, if they should obtain the force of law, *the whole right of trial would be committed, and constitutional discipline set at defiance ! !* I am disposed to believe that whatever is rightly, that is, *constitutionally and canonically* bound on earth, is bound in heaven; *but can any*

man in his senses suppose that there is any force in a sentence not constitutionally inflicted!! If such is the case, the whole Protestant church stands this moment excommunicated! The maxim of the Apostle is, that they who have a written law, shall be judged by that law, and to guard this claim, it would appear *that we were forbidden*, by the highest ecclesiastical authority, *to acknowledge*, much more TO SANCTION ANY ASSUMED POWER. [*See the bishop's Pastoral Letter of* 1808, *page* 62.]

For my part I have no hesitation in acknowledging both the AUTHORITY *of Mr. Rogers and his* RIGHT *constitutionally to exercise it.* I consider every step, excepting that of deciding, *to what authority is Mr. Rogers* EXCLUSIVELY *amenable?* so informal and so extra-judicial that *no decision*, of course, no consequence affecting *the character or authority* of Mr. Rogers can grow out of it. And it has appeared to me that the only true ground of proceeding in this case is to commence it *de novo*, [anew] or to pass it by as a *clerical blunder*, and learn from this example, not to implicate the peace of the church through personal misunderstandings.

I should be pleased to accompany the bishop in his visitation of the church in Hebron, Jewitt City, and Poquatanic, (three only of the nine parishes which I visited have churches,) should the bishop be satisfied that it would be consistent with his duty to acknowledge Mr. Rogers' administrations, and to receive from him, as the curate, the subjects of confirmation, and to communicate with him in the offices of the church; otherwise I do not consider it prudent to hold myself responsible for any consequences that may grow out of your sincere wishes to serve them. This much, I can assure you, that no mention will be made of the unpleasant subject by them, but every attention and every mark of respect will be most cordially bestowed, should you feel justified in pursuing the course I have suggested. Having pledged myself not to lead you into any unpleasant dilemma, I feel it my duty not to withhold any information by which you might be enabled to judge correctly of the feelings of a great proportion of society, and might be enabled to form an opinion and make your decision accordingly. No people, I am sure, will more

cordially welcome the bishop, or treat him with greater respect, under the forementioned conditions, than those under the care of Mr. Rogers. They hold out the *branch of peace* on constitutional principles, and they feel that there can be no security left to the church, but by adhering strictly to its principles. And sir, I venture to say, that at least one half of the clergy of this state are of the same opinion. With the most profound assurances of my cordial respects and dutiful submission to every *constitutional* and *canonical* direction, I am, Right Reverend Sir, your's, affectionately,

SOLOMON BLAKESLEE.

CHAPTER VII.

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH CONTINUED.

Within a few days after the receipt of the foregoing letter, Bishop Hobart published, or caused to be published, in all the newspapers printed in Connecticut, that he would visit the different Episcopal churches in that state, on such particular days as he therein designated, and among others, that he would visit St. Peter's church in Hebron, on the 20th day of August, 1817, and St. George's church in Jewitt City, on such a day in that month, and St. James' church in Poquatanic, on another day in that month. Expectation was all alive. No suspicion was entertained that all was not right, or that a plan was formed for my ruin or their destruction. Great preparations were made for their own spiritual improvement in the public worship of God, and instruction from his word; in confirmation or the laying on of hands, in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and God's blessing, all by the bishop. Great curiosity was awakened, for not one out of an hundred of the people in my care, had ever seen a bishop in their lives. Great preparations were made to honor him and to make him welcome. I had taken unusual trouble in preaching lectures on the subject of confirmation, and in going from house to

house in all my parishes, to endeavor to explain it to them, and to solemnize their minds for the proper and worthy reception of that interesting rite. On the night before the 20th of August, Mr. Ezekiel Brown, one of the wardens of the church, in Hebron, came to me after dark. The heart of the good man was ready to burst, the tears streamed from his eyes, and he was unable to speak; at length, with a broken and a faultering voice, he said, I have bad news; the bishop is a going to disappoint us; he says that he cannot visit our church because you are here; if you were not here he would come.

This was the first intimation that the plan was to drive me off, or to ruin me, or to divide and scatter the churches and congregations, which I had gathered. There was no time for reflection or consultation. If the bishop did not intend to visit my parishes, why did he impose upon the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee, by directing him to preach to them, and to give them false notice? Why did he pledge himself in all the newspapers to me, to my people, and to the whole world! He had received Mr Blakeslee's letter, and knew upon what terms he would be received. He was expected in Hebron at four o'clock the next afternoon, and it was thought advisable for me to go with the wardens and Dr. Peters, the next morning, to the next town, where the bishop was, and if possible make some arrangements with him. This was done, and he alleged that a compliance with the terms of Mr. Blakeslee's letter, would be an interference on his part with the proceedings of Bishop Jarvis, and would be calling upon himself the resentment of his friends; and that he did not wish to have any thing to do with it one way or the other; at length he agreed that he would perform his engagements, and not disappoint the people. if the wardens would give in writing under their hands, *that they would not consider him as recognizing me as a minister* ON THAT DAY. He said expressly, that he did not wish to approve or disapprove of me, as a minister, but that his wish and intention was to leave me to-morrow as I was yesterday; he did not see me, lest it should, by Bishop Jarvis' friends, be construed into an arrangement between him and me. Rather than to have the people disap-

pointed, they consented to his proposal. He wrote a certificate to the amount of what he proposed, and the wardens signed it. I wish to have it distinctly understood that he did not see me, nor make any arrangements with me, or what I should say, or do, or where I should be. In regard to this, the wardens were not authorized, neither did they make any arrangement or agreement; but only for themselves and the church, *that they would not consider him as recognizing me as a minister on that day.* This was the amount of their certificate, and he expressly said again and again, that he did not wish to approve or disapprove of me, as a minister, but to leave me to-morrow as I was yesterday: that is, as discharging all the duties of a regular priest in the Episcopal church. With this certificate, he came to Hebron, in company with the honorable John S. Peters, and others. With them he came to the door of St. Peter's church in Hebron, on the 20th day of August, 1817. From 1500 to 2000 people were, by computation, assembled for public worship, for religious instruction, and for divine ordinances. About 150 persons were present, who were prepared and expected to be confirmed: which is the apostolic rite of laying on of hands after baptism. Great numbers were prepared to receive from the hands of the bishop, at that time, the sacrament of the Lord's supper. When he came to the door of the church, while he was fastening his horse and carriage, I went out and welcomed him to the church in Hebron; he made no reply, but said to one of the wardens, who was present, Mr. Rogers must withdraw; he replied, and not attend church? the bishop said yes; and instantly mounted his carriage, apparently in anger, and rode off, without consulting the other warden or the vestry, without any apology, without going into the church, and without even speaking to the people. The insult, the astonishment, the disappointment, are indescribable. It was with difficulty that many were restrained from offering him personal violence. The federal presbyterians were pleased, and some of them actually triumphed and exulted at what was done. The church people were mortified, disappointed, and ashamed. The bishop, instead of going to the house of the honorable John S. Peters, where he was

expected, and where he was expected to spend the night, went to a presbyterian tavern, had a luncheon, satisfied some of the presbyterians (and they were easily satisfied) that he had done right, and rode off. The other churches in my care he wholly neglected and disappointed. Thus more than FOUR THOUSAND people in the counties of Tolland, Windham and New London, in Connecticut, were in the month of August, 1817, neglected, insulted and abused by Bishop Hobart. This was matter of great joy to the enemies of our holy religion, and to the friends of Bishop Jarvis in the Episcopal church. At this time, some of my friends and parishioners from Jewitt City, and Poquatanic, to whom I had administered baptism, and the Lord's supper, attended Bishop Hobart's visitation in Norwich, and were confirmed by him, and received the sacrament. At this time, Colonel Jeremiah Halsey, who had been brought up a separate congregational presbyterian, who had for some time attended my ministry, with his family, but without examination, recommendation, or particular profession, now bolted himself in, among others, and was confirmed, and received the sacrament. After service, he had a private conversation with Bishop Hobart, at the house of Col. Tyler, and from that time, and never before, he became my enemy. The plan of causing me to submit to an indignity in my own parish, and in the presence of my own people, and others, or to drive me off and scatter my congregations, by inducing them to believe the decisions of our courts of law and the pastoral letter of the House of Bishops were of no force; and that I was not a clergyman of good standing in the church, was well calculated to effect the purpose of tyranny and oppression, in destroying a clergyman, without hearing or trial, according to any rule, canon or law; and one, of whom Bishop Jarvis himself had publicly and officially declared, in behalf of the convention of the whole state of Connecticut, "that we have nothing against him," [for they dare not come out and acknowledge that my opposition to an union of church and state, was their objection,] "we acknowledge his authority and character to be good." And of whom the bishop of New-York had declared "that he had always considered him one of the most use-

ful and active clergymen in that state, that he never had heard Bishop Provoost, his predecessor, express any sentiments of disapprobation with regard to him, and that he never had at any time, or on any occasion, fallen under the censure of the ecclesiastical authority of that state;" and of whom the Rev. Mr. Tyler of Norwich, the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee of New-London, and many other clergymen of the first respectability in Connecticut, had spoken in terms of great approbation, respect, and affection. The plan, however, although it checked the prosperity of the church in the eastern part of the state, gave her enemies great cause of triumph, gave them occasion to speak evil of me, and was a source of unhappiness to me and all my people. Yet it was not effectual; they determined still to adhere to me and support me. For this purpose a meeting was called in Windham, termed an EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE, at which many votes and resolutions were passed of great importance; some of which are as follows, viz.

At a meeting of the COMMITTEES OF CONFERENCE appointed by and in behalf of the members of the Episcopal church in Hebron, in Jewitt City, in Poquatanic, in Canterbury, in Hampton, in Stafford, in Andover, in Bolton, and in Columbia, duly notified and convened, in the court house in Windham, this 29th day of April, A. D. 1818,

Capt. ANDREW MANN, of Hebron, Moderator,

Mr. PASCAL CADY, of Canterbury, Clerk,

Voted unanimously, That it is our earnest wish and desire, and as far as we know or believe, it is the earnest wish and desire of the people that we represent, to be with the Rev. Ammi Rogers, (*with whom we are perfectly satisfied*) in union and communion with the Protestant Episcopal church in the state of Connecticut and in the United States, submitting ourselves to its GOVERNMENT, *when administered according to the authority of God's word and the constitution and canons of said church*, conforming ourselves to its doctrines and worship, as represented and set forth in the holy scriptures and in the book of common prayer. And the reverend and honorable convention of the Episcopal church in Connecticut, are hereby humbly requested to grant this privilege.

The letter from the Rev. Ammi Rogers, dated New-Haven. Oct. 15th, 1816, (*page* 67,) to the Right Rev. Bishop Hobart, was then introduced and read.

A vote was then passed approbatory of the said letter; and requesting the convention to accede to its terms, or grant a fair and canonical trial

A statement was then made, that it appeared to that meeting, 1st, That I had been rightly and canonically ordained DEACON and PRIEST in the state of New-York. 2d, That I had never been rightly and canonically forbidden, degraded, silenced, or even censured. 3d, That I had moved from the state of New York, and settled in the state of Connecticut, according to the canons of the church, as they existed at that time, and as other clergymen had done and then did. 4th, That canonical notice was given to Bishop Jarvis, and that he actually approved of it. 5th. That he afterwards in an unprecedented manner required of me testimonials from the state of New-York, in addition to my LETTERS OF ORDERS, which had never been disputed. 6th, That these testimonials were obtained and conveyed to the said Jarvis at three different times and in three different places. 7th, That the said Jarvis, regardless of his public and official assurance, of the authority of God's word, and the established order of the Episcopal church, issued and published papers forbidding me to preach in this state, &c.— 8th, That a solemn protest against those papers was then justly issued by me, and by a number of respectable parishes, and an appeal was made to the House of Bishops then next to be convened. 9th, That the said House of Bishops then decided that I was *exclusively* amenable to the authority of the Church in Connecticut, and directed a trial according to the constitution and canons of the church. 10th, That Bishop Jarvis, wholly disregarding the aforesaid decision of the said House of Bishops, his own vows of office, and the established order of discipline in the Episcopal church, issued and published another paper against me. 11th, That the church in Stamford had very justly resolved, that, if the bishop was not bound by the authority of God's word, and the established order of the church, they

were not to him, nor by him, and had very justly given a settlement independent of him. 12th. That our courts of law in Fairfield county, after full hearings and fair trials, and able counsel on both sides had solemnly adjudged and decided that the papers issued and published by Bishop Jarvis against me, were wholly without authority and void, and ought not to be regarded. 13th. That the House of Bishops in their pastoral letter of 1808, had virtually REVOKED AND DECLARED VOID the aforesaid papers of Bishop Jarvis.

Voted unanimously. That we heartily approve of the preceding statements, AND ON THIS GROUND WE STAND, &c.

The Letters of the Rev. Messrs. Tyler and Blakeslee, dated October 10th, 1816, (page 65,) and July 14th, 1817, (page 70.) were then introduced and read; whereupon

Voted unanimously. That the thanks of this meeting be presented to the Rev. Sol. Blakeslee, for his very excellent sermons delivered in Poquatanic, Jewitt City, Columbia, Canterbury, Hampton, Stafford, Andover, Bolton, and Hebron, in the month of July last; that great instruction and benefit have resulted to the aforesaid parishes from the same, and from his friendly and agreeable visits at that time, and that he is hereby respectfully requsted to repeat his visits and to preach to us again, as time and opportunity will permit.

Voted unanimously, That we heartily thank the Rev. Mr. Tyler and the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee, for the foregoing very excellent, sensible, and correct letters, to the Right Rev. Bishop Hobart; that the statements and sentiments therein contained are, in our apprehension, correct and true, and that we heartily and fully concur in them.

Voted, That the Moderator and Clerk of this meeting be a committee to publish our doings at this time, to cause them to be laid before the next reverend and honorable convention of the Episcopal church in Connecticut, and to request an answer to the questions therein proposed, viz. 1st. To be received into union and communion as is there requested. 2d, To take the case of Mr. Rogers into consideration, and to accede to the terms of peace and reconciliation, as proposed in his letter, *and to let the matter drop where it is;* or to grant

him a trial as is there requested. Or, 3d, To acquiesce in the decision and sentiments of the House of Bishops, as is herein before requested. Signed by us.

Andrew Mann, Zachariah Cone, Committee from St. Peter's church in Hebron.—Enoch Baker, Peleg Fry, Committee of St. George's church in Jewitt City.—James Cook, Peleg Rose, Committee from St. James' church in Poquatanic.—Jesse Parkes, Pascal Cady, Committee from Canterbury.—Uriah Litchfield, Rufus Fuller, Committee from Hampton.—Benning Mann, Richard Stroud, Committee from Stafford.—Elijah House, John Townsend, Committee from Andover.—Seth Collins, Ambrose Collins, Committee from Columbia.—John Talcott, Aaron Farmer, Committee from Bolton. Certified by us,

Andrew Mann, *Moderator of the said Meeting.*
Pascal Cady, *Clerk.*

Hebron, May 28th, 1818.

To the Reverend Secretary of the Convention of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut in 1818.

Sir,

We hereby request you to lay the inclosed doings of the meeting of the Committees of the members of the Episcopal church in several towns and parishes in the eastern part of Connecticut, called an Episcopal Conference before the next convention, to be holden in Bridgeport on the first Wednesday of June 1818, and to request in our behalf their decisions and answers to the request therein proposed.

Andrew Mann, *Moderator of said Meeting.*
Pascal Cady, *Clerk.*

To this convention, I addressed a letter, stating that I was solemnly consecrated to the ministry of the Gospel, for life; that I could truly say with St. Paul, I Cor. ix. 16, "*Necessity is laid upon me. yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel.*" I then united in the preceding requests; and further proposed, that if they would not accede to them, that then they would appoint a committee of all the clergy of the Episcopal church in the eastern part of the state, with full power to investigate and settle all matters respecting me, of every name and nature, ever since I had been ordained, that I would pay all the ex-

pense, and that I would give a bond, with good and sufficient security of ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS, to be well and truly paid to the said convention, if I did not abide by their decision.

To confess that they had persecuted me for seventeen years, without hearing or trial, merely because I was a republican and fully believed in the equal rights of all mankind, that there was no civil authority in this country which was not derived from the people, and which ought not, at short periods, to revert back to them; and because I was a Protestant Episcopalian, and did not believe that there was any ecclesiastical authority which was not derived from God, and must be regulated according to his word and the canons of the church, otherwise it was not his authority, and was of no force; that the civil and ecclesiastical authorities were separate and distinct in their own natures, and ought not to be united; that the religion established by the civil law in Connecticut, was an infringement upon the equal rights and privileges of all the citizens, and was in itself wrong. To confess all this, and that they had robbed me of my testimony.—(See Mr. Leeds' letter, page 54.)—That they had altered and forged the journal of the House of Bishops in 1808, (see page 63;) that they had endeavoured to ruin me as a clergyman, without the previous steps required by the authority of God's word, and the constitution and canons of the church, contrary to the direction of the House of Bishops, and to every principle of justice and morality —(See the decisions of our courts of law, page 50, and the bishop's pastoral letter page 62;) and that they had given official information to the church in Glastenbury which was palpably false, (see a letter to the Rev. Tillotson Bronson, page 56.) To confess all this, they were absolutely ashamed, and I now appeal to the reader, and to the whole world, if they could deny the facts with truth. They had injured me too much ever to forgive me; and not to comply with these most just and most reasonable requests, would be unchristian like and disgraceful. My faithfulness as a minister, and my strict morality as a man, were fully attested in every place where I had resided, and by every parish of which I had the charge, and ac-

knowledged by the bishop himself. I now gave a challenge to investigate all matters relative to me, and offered a bond of $1000. with good security, to abide by it. The secretary announced to the convention, in Bridgeport, (June 1818.) that he had such communications. Neither the requests nor the proposal was granted or rejected; *but another plan was operation which was designed to justify Bishop Hobart and themselves, and would effectually rid them of all further trouble on the subject.* This plan, it is not claimed, was formed or known by the convention, or by all the clergy, but one of them declared to Doct. Samuel Simons of Hebron, that he knew something *which was private*, and which he was not at liberty *to disclose*, but which would certainly drive me out of Hebron in less than one year. How could he know this, if it had not been agreed upon? Would Bishop Hobart? would the clergy of Connecticut? would any people in the world, if they sincerely loved God, and their fellow men for his sake, have treated any human being as I have been used? Would they reject all overtures of peace and reconciliation?—(see my letter, page 67;)—would our blessed Saviour and his apostles have refused and neglected more than four thousand precious and immortal souls? Would they have conducted as Bishop Hobart did in Hebron, (see page 77;) and a still more dreadful plan was now projected.

My mind for some years has been, at times, greatly distressed, from an apprehension that the inward disposition of my heart was not right before God. I could not but feel that I was injured and persecuted, and a resentment would sometimes arise. It was and has been for more than twenty years my custom, on each night, before I slept, to call myself to an account before God, and to note down the particular transactions of each day; and it is a fact that I have not eat a meal, nor staid a night in any house, nor performed any ministerial duty, for more than twenty years, which, by turning to my journal, I cannot tell when and where it was.

"O Almighty and Everlasting God, the protector of all that put their trust in thee, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy, increase and multiply upon me thy mercy; that thou being my ruler and guide, I may so pass through

things temporal, that finally I may not lose the things eternal; ingraft and continue in my heart the love of thy name, increase in me true religion, nourish me with all goodness, and of thy great mercy keep me in the same through Jesus Christ our Lord—Amen."

"Our Father who art in Heaven." &c.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BEGINNING OF THAT PERSECUTION BY WHICH I WAS IMPRISONED AND RUINED AFTER MANY YEARS UNAVAILING ATTEMPTS.

In the year 1816 Bishop Hobart was invited to take Episcopal charge of the church in Connecticut—I addressed a letter to him. (*See page* 67,) begging for peace and reconciliation. In 1817 by his direction, the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee visited my parishes, (*See his letter. page* 70 ;) on the 20th of August in that year Bishop Hobart came to the door of the church in Hebron, and because I would not submit to an indignity in my own parish, turned his back upon more than 1500 people, assembled for public worship, and disappointed more than 4000 in the neighboring towns and counties. (*See page* 77.) In 1818 a conference meeting of the Episcopal churches in the northeast part of Connecticut was held in Windham, at which they voted unanimously, *that they were perfectly satisfied with me.* (*See page* 79.) In 1818 I proposed that the convention of the Episcopal church in Connecticut should accede to the request of the churches convened in Windham ; or appoint a committee of all the Episcopal clergymen in the eastern part of Connecticut where I lived, with full power to call the wardens and vestries and congregations together, of all the parishes where I had ever resided or preached and to decide upon all matters relating to me ; that I would go with them myself, that I would pay all the expenses, and then offered a bond of $1000, with good and sufficient security, to be

well and truly paid to said convention, if I did not abide by their decision. But no, *a plan was known to some of them which was a secret*, and which they were not at liberty to disclose, and which was kept from me as the hour of death, but it would certainly answer all their purposes, and drive me out of Hebron in less than one year. What this plan could be no one could devise. Imagination was all alive—something was in contemplation—what could it be? One of Bishop Hobart's clergymen from the state of New York came into my neighborhood, but did not call upon me. He visited Dr. Avery Downer, in Preston, who was of no religious persuasion, and who had quarrelled with almost all the clergy in that neighborhood, of every denomination, and who then, and never before then, became my enemy; falsely representing me as unworthy and degraded, and that I should not preach there. It was then reported, that Asenath C. Smith, a single woman about 20 years of age, within about one mile of Jewitt City, to whom Dr. George Downer had been paying particular attention for about two or three years, the year before had been likely to have a child by him and had lost it. AND THEIR PLAN WAS TO INDUCE HER TO SWEAR IT FALSELY UPON ME, after all other means, from 1802. when I proposed to unite with the republicans, [*see page* 37, 38.] to the year 1818, had proved ineffectual. This plan would certainly drive me out of Hebron in less than one year.

THIS REALLY IS ONE OF THE MOST ABOMINABLE CONSPIRACIES THAT EVER WAS FORMED AGAINST ANY MAN IN ANY COUNTRY. Who formed this plan I do not know, but the testimony of their own witnesses will prove who executed it. And it certainly is promoting truth and justice; and it is suppressing perjury, wickedness and vice, to expose it to public animadversion and contempt. My religion, my principles, and my inclination, forbid me to speak evil of any one, any further forth than a sacred regard to truth and justice compel me. How much soever I may have done and suffered for the Episcopal church, and how much soever I believe the authority, admire the doctrine, and love the worship of God in that church, and how reluctantsoever I may feel in exposing the real faults of my brethren, who are of the clergy; yet to be silent

in this case, would be upholding perjury, subornation of perperjury, and the highest injustice to myself, to my children and friends, and to the church of Christ. So soon as this PLAN was known, the vestry of the church appointed a committee, who went to the house where the said Asenath resided, and diligently inquired into the truth of the report, of her, of her mother, and sister, and grandfather, with whom she lived ; and of her uncle Perry Clark, of his wife, Sophia Clark, and of all the family of said Clark, who resided in the same house with them ; and of the neighbors ; and after the said fair examination and a diligent inquiry ; they reported that the charges against me were wholly without any foundation in truth, and ought not to be regarded, and produced the following CERTIFICATE from the family, viz.

Griswold, January 5th, 1818.

We, the subscribers, hereby certify, that the Rev. Ammi Rogers has occasionally visited our family for these two or three years past, when we had sickness and death in the house, and at other times, that we have always considered him a worthy gentleman, an exemplary man, and a faithful and good clergyman, and not justly liable to reproach for any impropriety of conduct.

'Asenath Smith,' the girl. 'Elisha Geer,' her grand father, 'Anna Smith,' her mother. 'Maria A. Smith,' her sister.

We, the subscribers, hereby unite in the foregoing certificate, and declare that we do not know any impropriety of conduct of Mr. Rogers.

Perry Clark, Sophia Clark, Lester Clark; her uncle, aunt and cousin ; *who lived in the same house with her*, and this was about six months after the said Asenath lost her *supposed* child. She, and all the family, declared that I never had courted her, or kept her private company, and that I never had given them reason to believe that I would marry her, and that the whole story was a falsehood : whereupon, in St. James' church, in Poquatanic, it was voted unanimously, that they were perfectly satisfied with me, and with my conduct.

Mr. Enoch Baker and Mr. Peleg Fry were a committee of St. George's church, in Jewitt City, who also went to the

house where the said Asenath resided, and made diligent and faithful inquiry of her, of her mother, and of her grandfather, and sister; of Mr. Perry Clark and his family, and of the neighbors, and could find nothing to my disadvantage; but that the story was wholly without any foundation in truth, and ought not to be regarded; and so they reported to the church, which report was unanimously accepted; and voted that my conduct had been perfectly unexceptionable. During all this time I was in Hebron, a distance of about 30 miles, and knew nothing of what was going on.

Halsey and Downer being thus foiled in their plan, resolved upon one expedient more, and that was to frighten and compel her to swear her supposed child, for she never had one, not upon Dr. George Downer, but upon me; and for this Halsey entered a complaint against her, before a federal presbyterian justice, of their party, and induced Eleazer B. Downing to swear that about seven months before that time he had delivered the said Asenath of a dead fœtus, and then threatened her, if she did not swear it upon me, she should be whipped at the public post; that she should be stripped naked, set upon a gallows with a rope about her neck, &c. and that she should be arrested on the next Monday. On the next day she left the county, and went privately to a friend's house in Hampton, about 14 miles. Within a few days I was informed what was done and where she was. I went to the house where she was, and she then communicated to me the foregoing statement of what was said and done, and then wrote the following deposition, and gave it me in her own hand writing, viz.

I, Asenath C. Smith, of Griswold, county of New-London, and state of Connecticut, of lawful age, depose and say, that in the forepart of the summer of 1817, and for a long time before, I was in the habit of keeping private company with Dr. George Downer, of Preston, and on or about the first day of July, 1817, and not long before he went his journey to the westward, he came to our house and staid all night; that I then, in the hope and expectation of honorable marriage with him, gave myself up to him, and was on that night, &c. by him and by no other person. I testify, that I never made my situation known to any living creature, in hopes that the said

doctor would return and by honorable marriage prevent his and my disgrace. I testify, that I continued pregnant by him, until about the 28th of October, when I was delivered of a dead child; which I have always thought was occasioned by being very weak, unwell and having fits; and further the deponent saith not. ASENATH C. SMITH.

Dated *Hampton, May 28th*, 1818.

The foregoing deposition was delivered to James Lanman, Esq. as evidence at the binding over of me for trial, and was kept by him, but on trial was wickedly and unjustly withheld and concealed, though demanded, and the court proceeded in the trrial without it. Will any body say that this was a just and fair trial, before an impartial tribunal? Here was evidence to prove, in her own hand writing, that she had two years before charged her supposed child upon another man and that she had lost it by being very weak, unwell, and having fits.

From Hampton the said Asenath went in the stage to her uncle's, in Deerfield, in Massachusetts, and some months after her arrival there, she wrote the following letter to James Cook, Esq. who was one of the committee of the church, in Poquatanic, to inquire into the truth of the report of Halsey and Downer, as before stated, and who now reported that I had advised and assisted in getting her away, which was utterly false, for I was not within 30 miles of her, and knew nothing of what was said and done until after she was gone.

To James Cook, Esq. Preston, New-London county.

Deerfield, August 6th, 1818.

I do hereby certify, that I never have known any thing in the conduct of the Rev. Ammi Rogers unbecoming the gentleman, the Christian or the clergyman, and that he is no way justly liable to reproach in any of those matters, which some people have laid to his charge respecting me. They certainly have mistaken the person I was advised and assisted in leaving the county of New-London, not by Mr. Rogers, but by some persons who now reside there; and whatever misfortunes may have befallen me, they are not justly chargeable to him, but to them, and I think it no more than just and fair to clear him of every thing, of every name and nature, which may involve him on my account. ASENATH C. SMITH.

The foregoing communication, James Cook, Esq. received from the said Asenath by mail, and was delivered to James Lanman, Esq. the county attorney, as evidence at the binding over, and by him kept for the trial; and on trial he withheld and concealed it, though it was called for, and the court proceeded in the trial without it. Here were honor, character, profession, liberty, every thing depending! Will any person say that this was a just, and a fair and honorable trial? for officers of public justice to arraign any man as a criminal, conceal the evidence of his innocence, and proceed to condemn and ruin him, what can be worse? and what was the cause? Answer—see page 39. Under these accumulated afflictions and persecutions, what ought my feelings to be? what ought I to do? what should be my conduct? Shall I, like St. Peter, draw the sword? shall I, like the vicar of Wakefield, take my Bible in one hand, and my gun in the other, and demand justice or death? shall I, like St. Stephen, pray for my persecutors and murderers? Or, shall I, like my blessed Saviour, open not my mouth to them?

O, Almighty and most merciful God, be pleased, I beseech thee, to direct and assist me in all my doings, and in all my sufferings, with thy most gracious favor; give me all such things as are necessary and profitable for me; defend me from all such things as are hurtful, either to my body or to my soul; and finally, by thy mercy, receive me into everlasting life, through Jesus Christ my Lord, in whose most holy name, and all-prevailing form of words, I sum up these and all my prayers, saying as he has taught and expressly commanded me, that when I did pray I should say, "Our Father who art in Heaven," &c.

CHAPTER IX.

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH CONTINUED.

In the month of March or April 1819, Asenath C. Smith returned to Griswold. Her mother for many months had

been sick with a hectic fever, which was a family complaint, and soon afterwards died. Doct. Avery Downer, was their family physician, was very unfriendly to me, and by misrepresentations had made unfavourable impressions on their minds, and particularly Maria was willing to go all lengths. Soon after Asenath returned, Col. Halsey and Doct. Downer went to the house of Elisha Geer, for the purpose of inducing her to charge that supposed child upon me, which she had before justly and truly charged upon the son of the said Doctor, and to go still farther, by saying it was destroyed by me. The whole story was contrived, planned and laid out. They took Asenath into a private bed-room alone, conversed with her in private, they said as friends; they staid all night; the next morning Halsey dictated the whole story which he wished the said Aseneth and Maria to testify. Doct. Downer wrote it, and they learnt it by heart. They were promised riches, honor, friendship, universal respect, safety, secrecy, and indemnity. Col. Halsey, was an old experienced lawyer, and knew what would do, and how to contrive. Doct. Downer was a learned, sensible man, and much looked up to. Bishop Hobart's neglect of my parishes, had raised a hue and cry against me; other denominations were all alive, one word, or even a hint was enough to set them in motion, and particularly the Presbyterians in Griswold and Preston, considered me their political and religious enemy. I had built up the Episcopal church where the service had never been performed before, there cause was failing, jealousy and animosity were on the alert. Halsey pledged to those girls, *before witnesses*, his life, and his honor, that it never should hurt them, it should cost them nothing, they should be protected against all prosecution, and it would be the best and most honorable thing that they could do. And Mr. Lanman, a senator of the United States, and a state's attorney, would take their part, would befriend and protect them. Within a few days after, Mr. Lanman himself came from Norwich to old Mr. Geer's, 8 miles, took Asenath into their east chamber alone, at about two o'clock in the afternoon, and was there shut up with her until nine or ten o'clock at night; and she says, what he said and did; that he there, and then made her

the same promises, and gave her the same assurances which Halsey and Downer had done before. He also said to Mr. Perry Clark, that for Asenath to testify against me, would be the best and most honorable thing *that she could do;* that she should be protected against all prosecution, that it never should hurt her, or cost her any thing, *and that she need not, and should not be called upon to testify publicly in this case, but only before a justice and a few friends.* Halsey had before promised her, that if she would testify against me, if I had a cent of property in the world, he would get it, and she should have it. All this is solemnly sworn to by their own witnesses. Let any young woman like Asenath C. Smith, be courted for two or three years by a respectable young physician, like Doct. George Downer; let her meet with a misfortune, and have it known and sworn to; and let such men as Col Halsey, *noted for his intrigues with women*; let such a man as Doctor Downer, who was then of respectable standing in society, of great art, intrigue, and affability; let such a man as James Lanman, Esq. a senator of the United States, a noted lawyer, a state's attorney, and a strong Connecticut presbyterian.—Let three such men try their skill upon such a girl as Asenath C. Smith: let them engage her unprincipled sister, Maria, to assist them; and who can tell what they might not induce her to say or do? Who can tell what they might not induce her to testify? During all this time, I was in Hebron, a distance of 0 miles, and was not informed that she had returned from Massachusetts. I was wholly ignorant of the all-night visit, of the private bed-room contrivance, and of the east chamber conference and agreement. The whole business was kept from me a profound secret, until I came to Poquatanic on my regular business; when a friend suggested to me, that he understood that Col. Halsey and Doct. Downer had a plan of some kind in operation against me, relative to Asenath C. Smith; that Mr. Lanman was engaged in the business, and advised me to call on him for information. I soon went to Norwich, called on him, and found that a business of some kind relative to her, was already prepared, process was formed, and I was to be arrested. Lanman was hostile to a degree; in vain did I expostulate, in vain did I refer him to the

investigation of the churches in the neighbourhood, to the report of committees, to the documents in my possession. In vain did I urge a delay until I could furnish him with satisfactory evidence of my innocence. No! the deadly blow was aimed; *he said in so many words, that I had done more injury to the established religion of Connecticut, than any man he ever knew; that many of my own persuasion were against me, and that he was determined to drive me out of the ministry, and out of the state.* I acknowledged service, procured bail, agreed upon a day for a court of inquiry. The information was brought before Farwel Coit, Esq. his own cousin, and who was noted for favouring Mr. Lanman's views, and was of his own political and religious persuasion. The 29th day of April, 1819, at Joseph R. Willoughby's tavern in Norwich, were the time and place agreed upon for the COURT OF INQUIRY, for which I had about ten days to prepare.

COURT OF INQUIRY

In Norwich, in the County of New London, in Connecticut, April 29th, 1819.

Present, FARWEL COIT, Esq. a Justice of the peace for said County.

JAMES LANMAN, Esq. State's Attorney for said County, and Colonel Halsey associated.

I, Ammi Rogers, was called and answered.

Mr. Lanman read his complaint, which was couched in language so offensive, that I am ashamed to lay it before the public, but which was well calculated to prejudice the minds of the public against the accused, before they had heard the evidence. The crimes charged were—

1st. That I had committed a crime with Aseneth Caroline Smith, an unmarried young woman, in the town of Griswold, in the county of New-London and state of Connecticut, on the first day of July, 1817; whereby, she then and there, unlawfully became like to have a child by me.

2d. That I had committed a crime with the said Aseneth, in said Griswold, on or about the 1st day of November in that same year, whereby she had lost said child by means used with her by me.

To these charges I pleaded not guilty, either in whole, or in any part.

Calvin Goddard, Esq. one of the noted Hartford Convention men, who was a strong federal congregational presbyterian, and who was strongly opposed to me in religion and politics, but who I thought would not betray the cause of his client, was my counsel, and Jacob B. Gurley, Esq. of New-London. They informed me that any attempt to counteract any complaint of that kind, brought by James Lanman before his cousin Farwel Coit, Esq. would be unavailing: but that I might hear their testimony and prepare for a trial before the Superior Court.

The witnesses on the part of the state were called and sworn—*Asenath Caroline Smith* was the first witness. She swore that the crimes charged upon me, just read concerning her were true, and then stated the circumstances, which she afterwards testified were dictated by Col. Halsey, and written by Doct. Downer at the time they came there and staid all night and took her into a private bed-room alone, and which she told them and they knew were false; and which Mr. Lanman afterwards came there and over persuaded her to swear were true, and it seemed that she swore to any thing and to every thing they wished.

Maria A. Smith, the supposed sister of the said Aseneth, was the second witness. She testified that I had courted the said Asenath, that she expected I would marry her, &c. The same which she afterwards testified was false, and which she stated that old Halsey, Doct. Downer, and James Lanman had hired her to say.

Doct. Eleazer B. Downing—That he delivered the said Asenath of a dead fœtus in Griswold, on the night of the 28th of Oct. 1817, that it was in a state of putrefaction and destroyed immediately; that he did not know who was the father of the child; that within his knowledge or belief I was not there, nor did he hear my name mentioned; that he should judge it was about four months from the time of impregnation; that he saw no mark of violence upon it or the mother, and that it might have been lost by sickness, infirmity, or accident.

Samuel Wheeler, a negro boy, testified that his master, once,

he did not know when, sent him to old Mr. Geer's after a bag; that they told him to go up chamber and get one; that he looked through a crack in the door, which was open about half a foot, there saw Asenath and me in bed together; that it was in the morning at sun about half an hour high. [*Is it probable, that a clergyman would be seen in bed with an unmarried young woman at sun half an hour high, and with the door open?*]

Elisha Geer, an old man, then about seventy, very intemperate, very deaf, very dim sighted, a professed deist, and not very noted for truth or integrity. He testified that he invited me there to visit his wife on her death bed; that I afterwards attended her funeral and preached a sermon; that he invited me there on Christmas and I came and eat supper, and staid all night; that afterwards his only son died, and I preached a funeral sermon; that he pastured my horse, and I sometimes came there and staid, and he thought I was courting Asenath, but that he did not know that Asenath had ever been like to have a child, and never heard of such a thing till within a short time.

Mr. Perry Clark and his wife—That they knew nothing of the truth of the charges against me, and that they never heard of any such things until long after they were said to have been committed.

Welcome A. Browning and his wife—Near neighbors of the said Asenath, testified that they knew nothing of the truth of the charges against me; that they never had heard any such things until long after they were said to have been committed; that he had reproved his negro for telling that story about me and had threatened to whip him, but did not do it. Mrs. Browning testified that she was at the house of Mr. Geer on the night when Asenath was said to be delivered, and staid till after ten o'clock—had no suspicion of her situation; helped to administer to her in a manner which would have given her an opportunity of knowing. Browning acknowledged that he informed James Cook, Esq. and Mr. Rose, when they, as a committee, called on him, that his negro Sam was a poor, lying, good-for nothing fellow, and that he could not believe him when he was sent on a common errand, and that he plac-

ed no confidence in his story. [Is this negro a proper witness to testify against a respectable clergyman? In any other case or state would he have been admitted?]

Some of the Brewsters and the widow Lester testified, that they lived in the neighbourhood of the said Asenath and Maria, and that they knew nothing against their character as to truth and veracity: but on trial, I am informed, that they wholly refused to testify any such thing, and that on that account they were not summoned.

WITNESSES ON THE PART OF THE ACCUSED.

James Cook, Esq. was the first witness—he is a man, among the very first as to reputation and standing, in that part of the country. He testified that Mr. Rose, and he were a committee appointed by the church in Poquatanic, to inquire into the reports, now charges, against Mr. Rogers; that they called upon Col. Halsey for information where to go; that he directed them to go to Elisha Geer's, to Welcome Browning's and to Ebenezer Clark's; that they accordingly went, and made faithful and diligent inquiry of Elisha Geer, of the said Asenath and Maria, and of their mother; and also of Mr. Perry Clark, of his wife and family who lived in the same house; that they all, separately and collectively, cleared Mr. Rogers of these charges, and of every other impropriety of conduct at their house; that what they had solemnly assured them, as a committee of the church, was wholly contrary to what they now had testified was true, and that the circumstances which Asenath and Maria had now sworn to, were so contrary to what he personally knew to be true, that he must think their testimony was false and ought not to be regarded; that they certainly must have lied one way or the other; that from the house of Mr. Geer, they went about 40 rods to Mr. Browning's, and made strict inquiry, if they knew that Mr. Rogers had ever courted or kept private company with Asenath C. Smith, or that she had been like to have a child by him, &c. that they declared that they did not, and wholly cleared him of every impropriety of conduct in their knowledge and belief; that they then inquired of them as to the negro's story, that he had been sent to Mr. Geer's after a bag, &c. that

Mr. Browning informed them that his negro was a poor, lying, good-for-nothing fellow; that he could not believe him when he was sent on a common errand; that he placed no confidence in his story and had threatened to whip him for it; that they then went to Mr. Ebenezer Clark's, and inquired faithfully of him, and his wife, and family, as to the truth of these charges, and found that they were entirely false and ought not to be regarded, and that they could find no impropriety in the conduct of Mr. Rogers; that they so reported to the church, and the report was unanimously accepted.

Mr. Peleg Rose, was the second witness—he was one of the vestrymen of the church, and a very respectable man. He testified that he personally knew that the facts testified by Esq. Cook, so far as they took place while they were together, and as to the report of the committee, were true; and further he recollected, that he himself, said to the mother of the said Asenath, in her presence, and in the presence of Mr. Geer and Maria, and of Mr. Clark and his family: Mr. Rogers is an unmarried man, and if he has ever courted your daughter, and you have ever had any expectation that he would marry her, I do not know that the church would object, but we, as a committee, want to know the truth; to which she replied, I know no such thing, nor do I believe any such thing, and to this they all agreed; and the certificate dated January 5th, 1813. (*see page* 87) was then read to them, which they all acknowledged was signed by them, that it was true and that they then could say no more nor less than what it contained.

Mrs. Priscilla Cook, was the third witness, the wife of James Cook, Esq. and a very respectable woman. She testified that from her own personal knowledge, I was at their house and staid all night, eight miles from Mr. Geer's, on a certain night when Asenath and Maria swore that I was there; that we set up until half after 11 o'clock; that I left my hat, whip, and boots, surtout and portmanteau in the room where she and her husband lodged; that in the morning they were where I left them, without the appearance of having been moved; that I slept in the room adjoining the one just mentioned, and within eight feet of her; that she was unwell and

had not been lost in sleep all night, and that she did not believe that the testimony of the said Asenath and Maria could be true.

Mr. Enoch Baker, who is a very respectable man, and as much to be believed as any other man, testified, That he and Mr. Fry were vestrymen of St. George's church, about one mile from the place where the said Asenath and Maria resided, that having heard of the report which Col. Halsey and Dr. Downer had raised against Mr. Rogers, they were appointed a committee in behalf of said church, to go to the house of Elisha Geer, and make faithful inquiry into the truth of it; that in the fore part of April, 1818, Mr. Fry and he went to the house of said Geer and inquired faithfully of him, of the said Asenath, of her mother, and of all the family, and that they all declared positively, that Mr. Rogers was absolutely innocent of the crimes now charged upon him, or of any other misconduct at their house, or within their knowledge or belief; and that the testimony which they had now given, was wholly contrary to what they had informed them; that they must have lied one way or the other, and that he did not think that any confidence ought to be placed in them; that they also went to the house of Mr. Browning, and inquired faithfully of him and his wife and could not find that Mr. Rogers was any way guilty of what is now laid to his charge, or of any improper conduct; that they so reported, and their report was unanimously accepted by the church

Mr Peleg Fry, was the next witness, and is a man of respectability, of truth, and veracity. He testified that he went as a committee with Mr. Baker, to the house of Mr. Geer and Mr. Browning; that what Mr. Baker had testified was true; and that Mrs. Browning informed them that she was at the house of Mr. Geer, on the night when she was said to be delivered, and staid till eleven o'clock, and administered to her in a manner that she would have been likely to discover if she was in child birth, and that she did not know or believe any such thing.

The following documents were then delivered to the Justice and Lanman, as evidence in the case.

1st. The deposition of the said Asenath, wherein she had

testified that on the same first day of July, 1817, she was, &c. with this same supposed child, and that she had lost it by being very weak, unwell, and having fits. (*see page* 88.) As important as this deposition was, on trial it was withheld and concealed, and the court proceeded without it. Was this just? was it honorable and fair? The year before she had charged this same supposed child, (for it is not certain that it was a child,) upon another man.

2d. The certificate of Elisha Geer and family, and of Perry Clark and family, in which, the year after she was said to have been delivered of the supposed child, under their own hands, they cleared me of these charges, or of any other impropriety of conduct. [*See page* 87.]

3d. The letter of the said Asenath, dated August 6th, 1818, to James Cook, Esq. in which she says, whatever misfortunes may have befallen her, they are not justly chargeable to Mr. Rogers. (*See page* 89.)

4th. The certificate containing the Report of the committee of St. George's church, in Jewitt City; that they had been in person to the house of Elisha Geer, &c. the same as Mr. Bak r and Mr. Fry now testified.

5th. The unanimous vote of the wardens and vestrymen of the said St. George's church, accepting and approving of the said report.

6th. The deposition of Capt. Thomas Miller, in which he testified that he heard Ebenezer Latham agree with Mr. Rogers to be in Jewitt City about the last of October, 1817, and to bid off some of his property, which was to be sold at auction. This was to shew the reason why I was in and about Jewitt City on the week before the said Asenath was said to have been delivered, though I never knew nor heard of such a thing of her, until many months afterwards.

7th. The deposition of Curtis Hickox, Esq. in which he testified, that on that very first day of July, 1817, when I was accused of committing that crime in Griswold, I was at his house in Washington, one hundred miles from Griswold, that he there and then paid me $40, in money, and took my receipt in full, dated at his house, one hundred miles from Griswold, on that very first day of July, 1817.

8th. The deposition of Dr. Wells Beardslee, in which he testified that I was in Kent, [near Washington.] one hundred miles from Griswold, on the first day of July, 1817, and for some time before, and that I was not in Griswold.

9th. The deposition of Homer Swift, Esq. in which he testified the same as Dr. Beardslee.

Derby, April 21st, 1818.

10th. *Certificate of Mr. Joel Chatfield.*—I do hereby certify, that I have been one of the wardens of the Episcopal parish of Union church, in Derby, for many years last past, and was one of the committee who employed the Rev. Ammi Rogers to preach in said church, which he did a part of the time for about seven years; that I have been personally and intimately acquainted with him for about 14 years last past; that about seven years of that time he made my house his home, and boarded in my family, when he was in the parish, and has occasionally made my house his home, ever since, and that I have always found him a very able, faithful, pious and exemplary clergyman; a man of truth, honor and strict integrity, and no way justly liable to reproach for any immorality or impropriety of conduct; that I have been a member, and attended several of the conventions of the Episcopal church, in the state in which the case of Mr. Rogers was attempted to be discussed, and from what I myself, have seen and heard in said conventions, I am fully convinced, that the ecclesiastical proceedings against him, have been not only unconstitutional and void, but unfair, oppressive, and cruel in the highest degree.

JOEL CHATFIELD.

In presence of LEMON CHATFIELD, STODDARD CHATFIELD.

11th. *Thomas Wells, of Hebron*, in the county of Tolland, and state of Connecticut, of lawful age, deposeth and saith, that he is one of the wardens of St. Peter's church in said Hebron; that he has been well acquainted with the character of the Rev. Ammi Rogers for between 25 and 30 years last past; that he had relations and friends who lived under the ministry of the said Rogers, in the state of New-York; that he himself was there, and that he considers the character of the said Rogers to be and to have been good: that the said Rogers has resided and preached in said Hebron a considera-

ble part of the time for between 5 and 6 years last past, and is now the settled minister of the Episcopal church in this place; that the deponent has usually attended all the society and church-meetings of said church; that in those meetings he has never known or heard of a vote or voice against said Rogers, except one man, who has long since sold his property and gone off. The deponent further says, that he has attended the convention of the Episcopal church in this state, and has made particular inquiry, and also when he was a member of the legislature of this state last fall at New-Haven, he made inquiry, and is fully satisfied that nothing has appeared in any proper manner, to the disadvantage of the said Rogers; and the deponent says, that he considers the character of the said Rogers, among his parishioners and most intimate acquaintance, to be, and to have been, good, as a minister, and as a man, and equal to that of ministers of the Gospel in general: and further the deponent saith not.—Dated at Hebron, the 26th day of April, 1819.

THOMAS WELLS.

Tolland County, ss. Hebron, April 26th, 1819.

Personally appeared Thomas Wells, signer of the foregoing deposition, and made solemn oath that the facts therein stated, were the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, before me, STEWART BEEBE, *Justice of Peace.*

Opened in Court. F. COIT, *Justice of Peace.*

Hiram Haughton, of Hebron, in the county of Tolland and state of Connecticut, of lawful age, deposeth and saith, that he now is, and for many years last past has been, one of the wardens of St. Peter's church in said Hebron; that he has been well acquainted with the character of the Rev. Ammi Rogers ever since he has preached in said Hebron, and that he considers it to be good. The deponent says that the said Rogers has resided and preached a considerable part of the time, for between five and six years last past, and is now the settled minister of the Episcopal church in this town; that ever since the said Rogers has preached in said Hebron, he has made his, the deponent's house, his home, and has boarded in his family when he was in the parish; and that he considers the conduct of the said Rogers, as a minister and as a

man, publicly and privately, to be good. The deponent says, that he has generally attended all the society meetings and church meetings of said Episcopal church; and that in these meetings he has never known nor heard of a hand or a voice against said Rogers, except one man, who has long since sold his property and gone off; that he considers the conduct and character of the said Rogers, among his parishioners and most intimate acquaintance, to be good, and equal to that of the ministers of the Gospel in general: and further the deponent saith not.—Dated at Hebron, the 26th day of April, 1819. HIRAM HAUGHTON.

Tolland County, ss. Hebron, April 26th, 1819.

Personally appeared Hiram Haughton, signer of the foregoing deposition, and made solemn oath that the facts therein stated, are the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. before me, STUART BEEBE, *Justice of the Peace.*

Shipman Haughton, of the town of Hebron, in the county of Tolland, and state of Connecticut, of lawful age, deposeth and saith, that he has been well acquainted with the character of the Rev. Ammi Rogers for more than twenty years last past; that he had brothers and sisters, and relations, who lived under the ministry of the said Rogers, while he resided in the state of New-York; that he himself was there, and from his own knowledge, and from the best information which he has been able to obtain, the character of the said Ammi Rogers is good as a minister, and as a man, and as a christian, &c. [the same as that of Mr. Wells and Mr. Hiram Haughton, and sworn before the same Justice of the Peace, at the same time.]

On the part of the state. Asenath was again called and examined as to the letter addressed to Capt. Cook. This she wholly denied to be her hand writing, or that she ever saw it, or knew any thing of it; but since, she has confessed that it was her letter, and written by her, and that it was true, and that she never should have denied it, had it not been for Col. Halsey and others; the hand writing was, however, compared and proved at the time before the court. The deposition dated May 28th, 818, she confessed that she wrote and signed, and would have sworn to it, as she has done since;

but said that I was the cause of it. The foregoing is the amount of the whole testimony delivered before the court at that time, so far as I can recollect, and so far as the minutes taken by me, at that time, will evince. The case was submitted to the justice without argument; and he, after some deliberation, ordered me to be bound over in a bond of $750, with good and sufficient security, for a trial on the said complaint, before the then next Superior Court to be holden in Norwich, in the September then following; and I was allowed five days to go among my acquaintance and procure bail or security for my appearance—I suppose in the hope that I would run away. Thus my destruction as a minister, which had been attempted for almost twenty years, was now likely to be effected. Bishop Hobart would be justified in his neglect of me, and of my parishes. Bishop Jarvis's friends would exult in their final success; my parishes were mortified and confounded, and I was in distress. I immediately resigned my parishes and declined all ministerial duties, except on extraordinary occasions. I procured bail and prepared for trial. *Let me pray.*

O, Father of mercies and God of all comfort, my only help in time of need, look down from heaven I humbly beseech thee, behold, visit and relieve me; look upon me with the eyes of thy mercy, comfort me with a sense of thy goodness, preserve me from the temptations of the enemy, give me patience under my affliction. Thou, O God, who knowest the hearts of all men, knowest that I am not guilty of the crimes charged upon me; in thy good time deliver me in thy righteousness; forgive the dreadful perjury and the subornation of perjury committed against me: of thy great mercy forgive my enemies, persecutors and slanderers, and turn their hearts; lift up the light of thy countenance upon me, and give me peace through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Our Father who art in heaven, &c.

"False witnesses with forged complaints,
Against my truth combin'd:
And to my charge such things they laid,
As I had ne'er design'd.

The good which I to them had done,
With evil they repaid ;
And did, with malice undeserv'd,
My harmless life invade," &c.
35th Psalm, 2d part in the Prayer Book.

CHAPTER X.

PERSECUTION.

To impeach a court of justice is not my intention, where there is no abuse of power. To err is human, to retract a known error is noble, is manly, is generous ; but with the evidence laid before the court of inquiry where is there any man of good sense and strict integrity, if he were unprejudiced, would have bound a respectable clergyman to a trial for crimes so enormous, and supported by testimony so doubtful? And where is there another state's attorney who would have gone eight miles, been shut up alone with a young woman, in the situation of Asenath, from one or two o'clock in the afternoon until nine or ten o'clock at night, and there advised, persuaded, and urged her to bring forward charges of that nature, and expose herself to everlasting dishonor and contempt !— for if their story which she related were true, and she had consented to what was alleged, and suffered herself to be operated upon in the manner she represented ; where is the woman on earth, who would, of her own accord, have come forward and told it? *If it were true*, I say, where is the woman on earth that would have told it? *If it were not true*, who would have told such a thing against herself? The story in itself, whether true or false, is disgraceful, and any of woman kind who would tell it, ought to be despised, and not to be believed one way or the other ; yet Mr. Lanman could say to this unfortunate girl, *that it would be the best and most honorable thing that she could do ;* that it never should hurt her, nor cost her any thing, that she should be protected, and that she need not,

and should not be called upon to testify publicly in the case; she followed his advice, has broken her peace of mind forever, and brought everlasting disgrace and ruin upon herself, and others, and what good, what profit, what advantage has she, or the public, derived from it! Let others take warning from this example, never to say or do that at one time, of which they would have just cause to be ashamed at another.

Within a few days after I was bound over, I called on Farwel Coit, Esq. at his house in Norwich, and requested him to return to me the foregoing papers, which I had delivered to him at the binding over; at that moment Mr. Lanman came in and directed him not to give them up, and insulted and abused me in that manner, of which any gentleman would be ashamed. Coit *refused to give up the papers* on the ground that it was his duty to keep them for the trial. My next object was to see the witnesses if possible, and learn from them the cause of their bringing these false charges against me; but they were kept out of my sight. Asenath was confined at the house of widow Lester, a strong Presbyterian woman of violent passions and prejudices in Griswold, and was guarded day and night, and forbidden to see me, or any of my friends, or to speak, or to have any communication with us. I sent counsel to converse with her, but he was refused. I interceded with Mr. Perry Clark to procure for me the privilege of speaking to her in his presence: that if she was a witness in a public prosecution, one party had as much right to converse with her as the other; but he said *they were afraid that she would retract*, that she was strictly guarded at the widow Lester's, and that he could give me no encouragement. Maria was gone off to parts unknown to me--I was out of business, and might as well board at one place as another, and it was convenient for me to board at Mr. Baker's in Jewett City, where I had formerly boarded; and did hope that by some means I might find out the PLAN which had induced these witnesses so swear falsely against me. I employed several friends to see Asenath, and talk with her on the subject, but no one could obtain an opportunity. It was said that the Rev. Levi Nelson, the Presbyterian minister of Lisbon, and the Rev. Horatio Waldo, the Presbyterian minister of Griswold,

had interested themselves so much as to go in person to the widow Lester's, and to exhort her to double diligence in keeping Asenath from me and my friends, lest the whole plan should be defeated. I received proposals which were said to come from Col. Halsey, that if I would pay him 400 dollars, the matter should all be hushed up, and no more done about it. I wholly refused to pay one cent, trusting that my righteousness would yet break forth as the noon-day. For about four months, Asenath was kept and guarded in this way, when she had an opportunity of going privately on a visit to Hampton, about fourteen miles. This was soon communicated to me; I immediately went to see her. At first she was frightened and retired; within a few moments she returned with tears of repentance, confessing and lamenting that she had been overpersuaded, and wickedly induced by threats and promises to lie and swear falsely against me; that she had never enjoyed one moment's peace of mind since; but what to do she did not know; if she did not testify again at the trial as she had done, she should be prosecuted for perjury and suffer all its penalties; if she did, she should perjure herself again; that she knew, I knew, and God knew, that what she had testified against me was false, and that she should be glad to retract and make amends to the utmost of her power, if she could be protected and secured. I informed her that Judge Swift was one of the most able counsellors in the state, and if she would engage to follow his advice as a lawyer I would do the same. To this she agreed. I took her into my carriage and conveyed her to Judge Swift's, in Windham, about seven miles. She there confessed to him that the charges against me, concerning her, were wholly false: that she had been overpersuaded by my enemies to swear falsely against me, that she was now ready and desirous of retracting, so far as she could consistently with her own safety, and wished for his advice as a lawyer. He replied, that if she had been overpersuaded to commit perjury, and now wished to retract, he knew no better way, than for her to go before a justice and confess it, and leave the state immediately; that they could not compel her to return unless she were given up by the executive of the state where she was, and that while ap-

plication was making to him, she might go to another state. To me he said, that there were various ways by which she might be got out of the state. and that he did not think that there was any man, who, if he were falsely accused, and the witnesses would retract and expose the plot which was formed against him, on condition that they should be protected, and he could not make his innocence appear in any other way, who would not do it. This was agreed upon.

To the Honorable Superior Court of Connecticut, to be holden in Norwich. in the county of New-London, Sept. 1819.

I, Asenath C. Smith, of the town of Griswold, in the county of New-London, and state of Connecticut, of lawful age, depose and say, that the information given, and the complaint made by James Lanman, Esq. attorney for the state of Connecticut, to Farwel Coit, Esq. a justice of the peace, dated Norwich, April 12th, 1819, against the Rev. Ammi Rogers and his conduct towards me, was then, and now is wholly, utterly, and absolutely false and unjust; and I further depose and say, that the testimony which I gave before the said Farwel Coit, Esq. on the 29th day of said April, 1819, was procured, dictated, and I was induced by Col. Halsey, Doct. Downer, and others, who overpersuaded and induced me to say what I did, and for which I am now sincerely sorry, and now confess that my testimony on that subject was wholly occasioned by them. and that it was unjust and wrong. Dated at Windham, September 2d, 1819. ASENATH C. SMITH.

Windham county, *ss.* Windham, Sept. 2d, 1819. Personally appeared the above named Asenath C. Smith, who subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition in due form of law, before me,

ABNER ROBINSON, *Justice of the Peace.*

At this, my political and religious enemies were greatly alarmed. Mr. Webb made out an extortionate bill of 9 dolls. and 88 cents for one day's keeping and service, the neighborhood was alarmed; suspicions were entertained that Lanman was sent for, that Asenath was to be arrested; my carriage was taken away; in the night she made her escape out at the back door, and found means to get out of the state into Massachusetts. I borrowed a saddle and went on horseback about

four miles to a tavern, where I staid, was pursued and watched, lest I should fall in company with Asenath and get her out of their power, but I did not see her that night after she left Webb's. The next morning I returned, paid Webb *his extravagant bill*, took my carriage, went off, and soon after saw Asenath in Massachusetts, where, according to promise, I provided a place where she could stay. For this transaction I have been greatly censured, but I have considered the matter with all the candour and impartiality which I possess, and still think I did right. If I, or my friends, were falsely accused, as I was; if the witnesses were concealed and guarded night and day from April to September, lest they should retract and expose the plot which was formed to destroy him by falsehood and perjury; if the witnesses should make their escape, and were willing to retract and expose the whole plot, on condition that they should be protected; if the first lawyer, who had been many years the first judge in the state, should advise to it; should I blame my friend for assisting the witness in getting out of the state, for finding a place for her, for protecting her in telling the truth, and exposing falsehood, perjury, injustice and oppression! and am I to be blamed in this transaction? who would not have done it? Within a short time after Asenath had made her escape, and the party were greatly alarmed lest their plan of persecution and destruction should be defeated, Maria A. Smith, who had returned, sent word to me by Les Clark, that she wanted very much to see me, that she was willing to retract what she had falsely testified against me, if she could do it with safety, and requested that I would meet her at such an hour, with him in a piece of woods a few rods east of their house. This I did, where I for the first time saw her after I was bound over, and where she freely and fully confessed to me, in the presence of Mr. Clark, that the testimony which she had given against me before Esq. Coit was false, that she knew that Asenath had no more reason or truth in charging her misfortunes upon me, than she would have had in charging them upon Mr. Nelson or upon Mr. Waldo, two congregational ministers in that neighbourhood, that if she could see her sister she would expose the whole plot, and requested me to convey her privately to the place where she

was; to this I consented. Soon after, she came on foot to the house where I was, and I conveyed her to her sister and brought her back again. She had written and sent to Mr. Lanman on the week before; dated Griswold, Sept. 9th, 1819, the substance of which is in the following deposition, which on the 22d day of that month, she transcribed and made oath to before Denison Palmer, Esq.

To the Honorable Superior Court, &c.

I, Maria A. Smith of Griswold, New-London county, and state of Connecticut, of lawful age, depose, and on my oath say, that I very much regret that I, and my sister Asenath C. Smith, were overpersuaded to testify to what we did before Esq. Coit, against Mr Rogers, and I cannot conscienciously say it again, though I do not intend to implicate myself; I have no reason to believe that the charges against Mr. Rogers by my sister are true, nor have I any personal knowledge of any improper conduct of Mr. Rogers; I never heard my sister mention these charges against Mr Rogers until after Col. Halsey and Dr. Downer came to our house and staid all night. A few weeks after my mother's death which was in May last, my sister begged of me my advice as a friend, whether it would not be best to leave this place. As we were in bed together one night, she introduced the subject in a very feeling manner, and expressed much sorrow for saying what she had: she said that the complaint against Mr. Rogers respecting her, was not true, and that she never should say it again; she told me that she felt conscious that she had injured Mr. Rogers through the persuasion of Col. Halsey and Doct. Downer and others. I heard them urge and persuade her to testify against Mr. Rogers contrary to what she told them was her judgment and inclination; I heard Col. Halsey say to her, I pledge to you my life and my honor, that it never shall hurt you, it will be more for your credit, it shall cost you nothing, you will have more friends, you shall be protected, &c. I further depose and say, that on the aforesaid night, my sister did acknowledge to me, that the letter received by Capt. Cook was her letter, and that she wrote it; that I have heard my sister several times mention the subject of Mr. Rogers' being wrongfully accused by, and concerning her, that she seemed very

sorry, mortified, and ashamed for what she had said and done; and I depose and say, that I am very sorry that I was overpersuaded to say that which has caused me much inconvenience and trouble, though I do not intend to involve myself in any contradictions, or any more law business. And further the deponent saith not.

MARIA A. SMITH.

New-London county. ss. Griswold, Sept. 22d, 1819.

Personally appeared the above named Maria A. Smith, who hath written and subscribed the foregoing deposition, and made solemn oath that the same contains the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, before me.

DENISON PALMER. *Justice of the Peace.*

New London county. Superior Court, Sept. 1819. *opened in court by* CHARLES LATHROP, *Clerk.*

SUPERIOR COURT,

COUNTY OF NEW LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1819.

The case of Ammi Rogers was called.

I was present, with witnesses, and with the foregoing depositions of Asenath C. and Maria A. Smith; they had also each of them written to Calvin Goddard, E-q. who was counsel for me, and to Mr. Lauman also, and confessed to him, in their hand writing, and in the fullest terms, my innocence of the crimes and misconduct which they had been wickedly induced to charge falsely upon me.—I was prepared for trial. Mr. *Lauman moved to have the case continued. Mr. Goddard, for reasons unknown to me, did not object, and the case was continued;* but no further bonds were required, and it was supposed that the case was dropped or dismissed.

I now had such evidence of my innocence, as enabled me in some measure to resume my ministry. Maria was in Groton, and constantly and fully declared my innocence, and her own false swearing by the influence of certain persons that she named. Asenath was in Massachusetts, and was determined to go into Canada, and go into business as a tailoress, milliner and mantau-maker. She then wrote a letter to the church in Hebron, in which she explains the reasons which induced her to accuse me falsely, solemnly declares my innocence,

confesses her own guilt and unworthiness, and humbly supplicates mercy and forgiveness. This letter, dated October 5th. 1819, was read before a joint committee of both Houses of the Honorable General Assembly of Connecticut in Hartford, May, 1823, and she there in person, before them, solemnly made oath and testified that it was her letter, written with her own hand, because she thought it her duty, that it was true, and that it was written without the assistance, influence or agency of any one She however went into the state of Vermont, and remained there until sometime the next summer. I collected a congregation in Chester village, in Massachusetts, and preached there, and in Blanford, and in some parts of Connecticut.

SUPERIOR COURT.

NEW-LONDON COUNTY, NORWICH, JANUARY, 1820.

Present the Hon. JEREMIAH G. BRAINARD. *Judge.*

Colonel Halsey and Jirah Isham, Esq. counsel for the state, in the absence of Mr. Lanman. Calvin Goddard, Esq. and Jacob B. Gurley, Esq. counsel for me. The first day of February, 1820, was assigned for the trial. I collected my witnesses, sent a subpœna for Maria A. Smith, she came to Norwich, and in my absence, and without my knowledge, wrote to my counsel the following deposition, viz.

To the Honorable Superior Court, &c.

I, Maria A Smith, of Griswold, New-London County, of lawful age, depose and say, that I regret, &c. (the same as page 109.) I further depose and say, that I heard James Lanman, Esq. say, and expressly agree with my sister, as an inducement for her to testify against Mr. Rogers, that it might be done privately: that she need not and should not be called upon to testify in open court. The misfortunes alluded to, happened to my sister in 1817, and I never heard her, in any way or manner, accuse Mr. Rogers until 1819, and I fully believe the whole business was a plot and a plan to destroy Mr. Rogers unjustly: and further, that the following certificate was and is true. (*See page* 87.) MARIA A. SMITH.

Tolland County, ss. Union, May 30th. 1820.

Personally appeared the above named Maria A. Smith,

who subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition, in due form of law, before me,

WILLIAM FOSTER, *Justice of Peace.*

The foregoing deposition was first written in part, and sworn to before Denison Palmer, Esq on the 22d of September, 1819 (page 109,) then the amount of it written and sent to Mr. Goddard, with an offer of coming before the Superior court then in session, and in person, testifying to the truth of the facts therein stated but was advised not to do it. She then absconded, went into Massachusetts, and after about four months, at the house of William Foster, Esq. she again copied it with her own hand, and of her own accord: she then signed it and made solemn oath to the truth of it, and it certainly was true, and yet, on trial before the superior court in New-London, she swore it was utterly false.

My witnesses were collected, my testimony laid before the Justice at the binding over was in his possession; the deposition of Asenath C. Smith before Abner Robinson, Esq. *page* 107, and the deposition of Maria A. Smith before Denison Palmer, Esq. *page* 109, and their letters to Mr. Goddard, were all ready. Col. Halsey had subpœnaed about forty witnesses on the part of the state, and they were present; not one of them knew the truth of a single fact charged in the complaint. The case was called; I answered, and put myself on my country for trial; the Jury were impannelled, sworn, and paid. The case was now in their hands, and they were under solemn oath to return to the court a true verdict, according as the evidence should then be delivered in court; about forty witnesses on the part of the state were called and sworn, and I was actually in jeopardy. Elisha Geer was the first witness who was called and testified: Mr. Gurley asked him if he knew that any crime now charged upon me before the court was true: he testified that he did not. Mr. Gurley then said, if there be any witness present, who knows any one crime charged in the information against my client to be true, let him come forward and testify. It is not yet proved that a crime has been committed by any one, and I may now, as well as any time, make an objection. May it please the court, I do now object to any testimony in this case until the main facts charg-

ed be first proved. I submit it to the court if it be not contrary to the established law of evidence, to admit collateral testimony until the main facts charged be first proved. Mr. Isham replied, that the main witnesses to the crimes charged, were, by the accused, got out of the jurisdiction of the court, and their testimony could not be had, that in such a case, it was admissible to prove what they had testified at the binding over, and cited one or two authorities to prove it: and moved that testimony to that amount be then admitted. Mr. Gurley objected, first, that the law had provided means whereby witnesses might be put under a recognizance to remain in the state and testify their knowledge in a case which was pending, and if the counsel had neglected that duty, the maxim in law would apply, viz. that no man shall take advantage of his own wrongs; secondly, he said that it was not yet proved that the witnesses were got out of the jurisdiction of the court by his client, and that was an offence which was not before the court, and he objected to any testimony to prove it. The question now before the court, and which I wish to have decided is, shall collateral testimony be admitted until the main facts charged be first proved? The court replied, it is manifestly contrary to the law of evidence to admit testimony to prove the circumstances of a crime until it be first proved that there has been a crime; in this case there is no evidence that a crime has been committed by any one; and until these facts be first proved it is inadmissible to prove any circumstances: the testimony cannot be admitted. Mr. Isham asked permission to introduce testimony to prove that the principal witnesses were got out of the state by the instrumentality of the accused. Mr. Gurley objected that, that was an offence which was not complained of in the information, and was not before the court, and he did object to any testimony on that subject; and the court adjudged and decided that it could not be admitted. Mr. Isham then moved to have the case continued. Mr. Gurley objected that the case was now before the jury, and that they were sworn to give a verdict: that the case had been continued on the part of the state once before: that the constitution had provided that every person who was accused should be entitled to a speedy trial; and

that no person should be put in jeopardy twice for the same offence; that if they were not ready for trial, why did they open the case, and that it was wrong to keep any one under bonds from month to month, from term to term, and from year to year; that he did object to the continuance of the case, and if it were taken from the jury it was without his consent. The court observed that the admission of hearsay testimony in certain cases was novel in this country, that he felt a delicacy in deciding it without the opinion and advice of the other Judges: he therefore should continue the case.

My bail was bound with me, in a bond of $750, that I should appear and answer to the charges against me, before the superior court in New-London county, in September, 1819. This I did. The case was then continued to January, 1820, but no further bail was required; I, however, appeared, answered, put myself out of the hands of my bail, on my country for trial, and had a trial; the case was taken from the jury, and continued again until the next September, but no farther bail was required; and for that reason, and for the objections made by Mr. Gurley, I did suppose that the question to be tried was merely a question of law, *and that I could not be put in jeopardy twice for the same offence;* and especially as it was well known that the witnesses, on whose testimony I was bound over, had retracted, and under oath confessed my innocence, and exposed the circumstances which induced them to accuse me falsely.

Some days before the trial, in September, 1820, Asenath returned to Connecticut, and wrote the following letter, viz.

To Calvin Goddard, Esq Norwich, Connecticut.

Hebron, September 24th, 1820.

Sir—I take this opportunity of informing you, as counsel for Mr. Rogers, that provided I can with safety appear before the superior court, I am willing to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, which will be to clear Mr. Rogers of the charges brought against him concerning me. I now expressly state to you, and I shall state the same before the court, that Mr. Rogers never did have carnal knowledge of me, that I never was like to have a child by him, that he never did present or use with me, any instrument of any kind, for the purpose of procuring an abortion nor

did he ever produce in me an abortion, or use with me any drugs or medicine, or other means for that purpose.

ASENATH CAROLINE SMITH.

The foregoing was written, signed, and declared to be her free act, in presence of us,

SETH COLLINS, SHIPMAN HAUGHTON, JOHN TOWNSEND.

The foregoing letter was delivered to me by Seth Collins, Esq. on the day after its date, and was on the same day by me delivered to Mr. Goddard, when I informed him that I expected Maria would be at court and testify as she did at the binding over. I asked and received his advice, and understood him to say that the charges against me could never be proved, unless asenath herself would swear that they were true; that she was their witness and she could not be compelled to testify against herself; if I brought her forward as a witness they might impeach her testimony by proving what she testified at the binding over; and I could not impeach my own witness, nor have the constitutional right of confronting the principal witness against me, the witness who alone could be supposed to know and testify whether the charges against me were true or not; the principal witness, on whose oath I was bound over for trial, and on whose oath I ought to be condemned or acquitted; and if they brought her forward as a witness, (and without they did, the charges could never be proved against me, and I must be acquitted with honor,) she could then tell the whole story, how Col. Halsey and Doct. Downer went there and staid all night;—what they said and did; how one dictated and the other wrote the testimony which she and her sister gave at the binding over, and how Mr. Lanman went there, and was shut up alone with her in their east chamber, and what she said and did, and they could not impeach their own witness. His advice was for me not to offer her as a witness, but let her be at court, and they must bring her forward as a witness or dismiss the suit. With this advice I went with confidence to the court Here Mr. Lanman, with all the violence of an infuriate persecutor, caused me and a friend of mine to be arrested and brought before the court for carrying off the witnesses.—He proposed excessive bonds; the court lowered them one

half; I offered bail, he objected. I proved that the bail was abundantly good, and it was accepted by the court. I prayed that my trial might be put off until the next Thursday, and it was granted. Mr. Gurley wished to be excused from acting as counsel for me any further, on account of an expectation which he had of being state's attorney; this he did not say, but I understood it; and he was appointed. I requested Mr. Cleaveland to take his place, and I used all diligence to collect my witnesses. I went to Massachusetts after Samuel Johnson, Esq.; Asenath came to New-London with Mr. Shipman Haughton, Seth Collins, Esq. and Capt. John Townsend, from Hebron, and put up at Dodge's tavern. She did not wish to have it known that she was there until the trial came on, that she might avoid being threatened or tampered with by Lanman and his party. Messrs. Enoch Baker and Peleg Fry attended from Griswold. Perry Clark and his wife were gone into the state of New-York, and could not be obtained; Ebenezer Latham was in the state of Ohio; but Capt. Miller's deposition was admitted at the binding over, and was in the hands of the justice; James Cook, Esq. from Preston, attended; Mr. Peleg Rose was detained by distressing and dangerous sickness, and did not attend; Samuel Johnson, Esq. was there. My witnesses and I put up at Dodge's tavern. The witnesses on the other part and Col. Halsey put up at Frink's tavern.

THE TRIAL.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT vs. AMMI ROGERS. } *Superior Court, New-London County, October 5th, 1820.*

Present the Hon. ASA CHAPMAN, *Judge*, [alone.]

James Lanman, Esq. State's Attorney,
Jeremiah Halsey, Esq.
Jirah Isham, Esq. } *Counsel for the State.*

Calvin Goddard, Esq.
William P. Cleaveland, Esq.
Jacob B. Gurley, Esq.
George Hill, Esq. } *Counsel for the Accused;* the first two were active, the last advisory.

I, Ammi Rogers, was called, and answered to this case, in September, 1819; then plead not guilty, either in whole or in

any part. The case was then, on motion of Mr. Lanman, continued to January term in 1820. I appeared and answered again, and plead not guilty, as before; put myself on my country for trial; the jury were empannelled and sworn; about forty witnesses on the part of the state were sworn. Elisha Geer testified; and it was inquired if any one present knew the truth of the facts charged upon me; they did not. Two important questions were then decided by the court: first, that it was contrary to the law of evidence to admit collateral testimony until the main facts charged be first proved; secondly, that hearsay testimony could not be admitted in a criminal prosecution. The counsel for the state again moved to have the case continued; my counsel objected; the court overruled, and the case was taken from the jury without my consent: and they could not render that verdict which they had just sworn in the presence of the ever living God that they would do. On the 5th day of October, 1820, in New-London, in the county of New-London, the same case was again called, and I again appeared, and answered: and the fourth time plead not guilty, either in whole or in any part, viz. before the justice at the binding over, before the Superior Court in Norwich, September, 1819, before the same court in January, 1820, and now again in New-London, October, 1820. The following Jury were impannelled and sworn, viz. John P. Trott, Charles Butler, Charles W. Wait, Eli Beardslee, George Raymond, Comstock Dart, James Mitchell, David Patten, Thomas Palmer, Simeon Chesebrough, Griswold Avery, Jr. Caleb Lyon.

The clerk then read the following INFORMATION.

To the Honorable Superior Court, &c. in New-London County.

James Lanman, Esq. attorney for said State, within and for said county, *information* gives, that in the town of Griswold in said county, *on the first day of July A. D.* 1817, Ammi Rogers of the town aforesaid, a transient preacher, *pretendedly of the Christian religion*, did, &c. assault make on the body of Asenath C. Smith, of said Griswold, a sole, single and unmarried young female, &c. and then and there, &c. did unlawfully, &c. with a bastard child—[*The words of Mr. Lanman in the information, are so very abusive, malicious, indecent, ob-*

scene and disgusting, that I am absolutely ashamed to repeat them, or to lay them before the public; and I now give notice that I shall avoid and omit every indelicacy of expression, so far as the nature of the case and a just regard to myself and the public will permit.] And the said attorney further information gives. that the said Ammi Rogers did, on or about the first day of November, in the year aforesaid, in the said town of Griswold, &c. by the use of pernicious drugs and an unusual instrument, *produce in her, the said Asenath, an abortion of the said child, &c. &c.* all which wrong doings of the said Rogers, are against the peace of the state and the laws of the same. &c. a high crime and misdemeanor, and to the evil example of others in like cases to offend.—Dated at Norwich, September 28th, A. D. 1820.

JAMES LANMAN, Attorney.

Was there ever a clergyman in any Protestant country, so falsely accused, persecuted, insulted and abused! and all because I was opposed to a union of Church and State, (*See page* 37.) but I am now in their hands.

The Clerk of the Court then said to me, hold up your hand: are you guilty, or not guilty of what is now charged upon you in this information? I answered: *I am not guilty, either in whole or in any part, and I have no idea that my accusers ever thought that I was guilty.*

The Jury were then called again, and again sworn that they would give a true verdict on the charges contained in that information, just read in their hearing, according to the evidence, then delivered in Court.

The witnesses on the part of the State were called and sworn.

It was expected that Mr. Goddard would have made a challenge, that if there were any witnesses present who knew, and would testify, that I ever had committed these, or any other crimes, with Asenath Caroline Smith, they would then come forward and testify, and that he did object to any testimony in the case, until that was done. Would not any lawyer who was true to his client and sincerely intended to defend him, have done this? I appeal to every gentleman of the Bar; would not you have done it? In this case, Asenath, who was then in town, must have been brought forward

and she would have exposed the whole plot, or I must have been acquitted with honor. But my counsel, in whose hands I had placed myself, my cause, my character, my profession, my liberty, my all, for reasons unknown and unexpected to me did not take that stand.

Elisha Geer was the first witness; he is grandfather of Asenath C. Smith and Maria A. Smith. Mr. Goddard informed the court that this case had once been committed to a jury, witnesses were sworn and examined, and was opened on the part of the state, and the accused was actually in jeopardy, the case was taken from the jury without his consent: and by the constitution of the United States no person could be put in jeopardy twice for the same thing or on the same charge. The court decided that no one could be considered as having been in jeopardy until a verdict had been rendered. The counsel did not object to the trial, *on the statute of limitation* of which I was at that time ignorant; the crimes alleged were outlawed by the state law of Connecticut. Mr. Geer testified the same as in page 95.

Question by Mr. Lanman. Do you not know that the prisoner was courting your grand-daughter? Mr. Goddard objected to the question as altogether irrelevent: it has nothing to do with the case on trial: we presume that it is no part of my client's offence that he was courting this girl, if it was true; courting is not an indictable crime, it constitutes no part of the offence charged in the information. Mr. Lanman replied, it certainly is admissible, to shew the nature of the intimacy which subsisted between the prisoner and this young woman; it shews the power and opportunity he had to commit the crimes alleged against him, and the inducement he had to act; it is furnishing some presumption that he did commit the crimes charged. Mr. Goddard replied that there was no evidence before the court that any crime ever was committed by any person with this young woman, or with any body else; and I do object to any testimony to prove the circumstances of a crime, or the inducements to commit a crime, until it be first proved that there has been a crime. The court overruled and directed the witnessess to proceed; *directly contrary to the decision of Judge Brainard in this very case only the*

term before. Mr. Goddard then informed Mr. Lanman and the court, that Asenath C. Smith was then in town; and it remained with her to say whether the charges were true or not. The court directed the witness to proceed. Mr. Geer then said, I had no doubt that the prisoner was courting my grand-daughter; they appeared like it and were very fond of each other, and I verily believed that he intended to make her his wife. This witness did not pretend to have any knowledge that any crime charged in the information was true, and his testimony was directly contrary to what he and all the family had assured Mr. Rose and others. (*See page* 97.)

Dr. E. B. Downing was the second witness; he testified the same as in page 94. The Judge informed him that it was an indelicate subject, but the facts must be stated as they were. How long should you judge that the fœtus had been dead? Ans. I do not know; I should think about a week. By Mr. Lanman.—How old should you judge the fœtus was! Ans. I should think that she must have been from the fourth to the sixth month of her pregnancy. By the same.—Did you observe any thing in the fœtus or its mother, whereby you should judge that there had been foul play? Ans. I did not: it was in a most putrified and offensive state. By Mr. Goddard —Might not this abortion in your opinion, have been produced by sickness, infirmity, or accident in the mother? Ans. Yes, sir, it might have been produced by either. By the same.—Did you see or notice any mark of violence upon the mother or upon the child. Ans. I did not.

Maria A. Smith was the next witness; she was the *supposed* sister of the said Asenath, then about 21 years of age, and between two and three years younger than the said Asenath; she was tall and a good figure, very handsome, had a better education, as to learning than common; she dressed well and appeared well, was very fluent and impressive in speech; *but was a great liar, and said to be unchaste.* She began by saying, *I have told so many different stories and contradicted myself so often on the subject now before the court, that I did not think my testimony would be received.* The court directed her to proceed. She then testified that she first became acquainted with me in August, 1815, when I came to their

house to preach a funeral sermon ; she did not know that I was there again until Christmas, when I eat supper and staid all night, &c. the same as in page 94. She then told a story about her going to Brimfield to see her sister ; that she had written to Mr. Lanman, and informed him that she had no reason to believe that the charges against me were true ; that she had been before Denison Palmer, a justice of the peace, and made oath to it ; that she had written to Mr. Goddard and offered to come before the court and swear to it, but that she had been influenced by me to do it. (I suppose Mr. Lanman told her to say so,) and she testified a great many other things concerning herself, which had nothing to do with the case—she testified and said, Mr. Rogers took me into his own carriage and carried me to Union, in Connecticut, where I calculated to stay at a Mrs. Eaton's ; when we arrived at a Mr. Mercer's, within about one mile of Mrs. Eaton's. it was dark and the roads very bad ; Mr. Rogers said we had better leave the chaise and walk : knowing that I was in his power, I complied ; and he led me on the road into a most dismal and gloomy swamp, when he stopped, stepped before me, and told me to promise him that I would sign and swear to a deposition in his favor. Situated as I was, in the midst of a most dismal swamp, late at night, a total stranger, I was compelled to do it ; and the next morning he carried me before Esquire Foster, where, dictated by him, I copied the letter, which I had written to Mr. Lanman, into the form of a deposition, [it was the same that she had before sworn to before Denison Palmer, page 109,] and I signed it and swore to it.*

*Human language never uttered greater and more malicious falsehoods! There is not now, and never has been a swamp, of any kind, on the road she mentioned ; but it would answer Mr. Lanman's purpose, in doing away the testimony which she had given, in contradiction of what they had induced her to testify when I was bound over for trial. I could not, at that time, prove the falsity of her testimony, but since, I have obtained the following deposition, and she has herself confessed that she lied :—

I, Benjamin Smith, of Holland, Hampden county, Massachusetts, of lawful age, depose and say, that for about 40 years last past, I have resided on the road between Mr. Mercer's and Mrs. Eaton's, where Maria A. Smith resided for some time in 1820, at about an equal distance from

She testified that I had kept private company with her sister, from about Christmas, 1815, to October, 1817; that she had seen us in bed together; that in October, 1817, I came to their house one Tuesday evening, and remained shut up in a chamber alone with her sister day and night, until Saturday morning; that the door was kept fastened, and none of the family were admitted: that on Thursday evening she and her mother heard a most dismal screetch, and ran up stairs to know what was the matter; that the door was fastened, and they demanded admittance, and after some delay they were admitted, when they found Asenath lying on the bed, and me standing by her holding a sheet over her head, and said she had got hysterics, and I would take care of her, and they went down and left us. [All this is contradicted by Perry Clark, Sophia Clark, and Lester Clark, under oath, but their testimony could not be had on trial.]—That on Saturday morning I went from there, and the next week she was delivered of a dead child; that on the Saturday night before the first Monday in May, 1818, I came to their house about 12 o'clock at night, when they were in bed, that I staid about three hours, and advised Asenath to go away, and the next day Andrew Clark conveyed her to Hampton.

Question by Mr. Lanman. Have you lately seen and conversed with the prisoner? Answer. About three weeks ago Samuel Johnson, Esq. of Chester, came to see me, and brought a letter from Mr. Rogers, requesting to see me alone, and I, by the advice of Doct. Daniels, wholly refused, &c.

By Mr. Goddard. Is your sister subject to hysterics? She

---

each of said dwellings; that the distance is about one mile; that in said distance on said road, are four dwelling houses, at about 60 rods from each other; that the said road is very rough and stony, and not suitable for a chaise; but that on said road there is not now, and never has been any kind of a swamp—much less such a most gloomy and most terrific swamp as it is set forth and represented in the testimony of Maria A. Smith against Amma Rogers in 1820. I saw her several times while she resided at Mrs. Eaton's, but she never complained to me of any ill treatment from Mr. Rogers, and I never heard that she ever complained to any body that she had not been used well; and further the deponent saith not BENJAMIN SMITH.

September 18th, 1823.

has been, but had none for some months before I heard that shriek in the chamber. By the same. How many months? Ans. Not for six months, I should think. By the same. Do you swear that you had not known her to have fits in six months before that time? Ans. I do not think she had. Perry Clark, Sophia Clark, and Lester Clark, have since the trial sworn directly contrary to this. But admitting the whole story to be true, I ask every juryman on his oath; I ask the whole world, does it prove any one crime charged upon me in the information? What if I did suppose that if Maria and Daniels should go to court and testify against me, I should be condemned? Does that prove that I was guilty? might not the most innocent person on earth be condemned on their testimony? At this time Mr. John C. Baker, who was one of their witnesses, came and informed me privately, that Mr. Lester Clark had returned to Griswold and desired him to inform me, that he knew that which would wholly destroy the testimony of Maria A. Smith, and that if he was sent for he would come and testify. I then said to the judge, there is now a witness, within a few miles of this place, and within the jurisdiction of this court, whose testimony is necessary in my defence; I am now at the bar on trial, and have it not in my power to send for him, I therefore pray the court to send for him. Mr. Lanman objected. I replied that I was then on trial and had it not in my power to send. And on that ground I pray the court to send. *The court wholly declined*, and directed them to proceed without him. Was there ever such a thing before?

Andrew Clark was the next witness. The third of May, 1818, I think Asenath asked me to carry her to her uncle's in Windham. I carried her there, and she paid me out of a two dollar bill. By Mr. Lanman.—Have you any knowledge that Rogers came to your house to court Asenath? Ans. I do not know; he was there frequently, and they appeared fond of each other. By. Mr. Goddard.—Is Asenath subject to fits? Ans. She is. By the same.—Had she any fits a short time before the noise was said to be heard in her chamber?—Ans. I think she had, not a great while before that time. By the same.—Do you think within six months? Ans. I should

think she had within that time. [Perry Clark, Sophia Clark, and Lester Clark, have testified since the trial, that they never knew me to be shut up with Asenath a day or a night in the world; that they never knew nor heard of such a noise at their house as Maria described, until about two years afterwards; that at the time the noise was said to be heard, they well remembered that Asenath was sick, and had fits, and fell from her bed on the floor, and Lester then offered to go after a doctor for her, and her mother objected. They all swear that in the summer and fall of 1817, Asenath was very sickly, weak and unwell, and had fits; that she was so when I came there on business of Mr. Latham, the week before she was said to be delivered, and that she then had fits and fell; and she both before and since the trial testified that by these means, she supposed, she lost her child, if she ever was like to have one; she was in town ready to testify the same on trial. But if I brought her forward as a witness, they could prove what she was induced to swear falsely at the binding over, and I could not contradict it nor impeach my own witness. They refused to bring her forward as a witness, and on that ground I was deprived of the constitutional right of confronting the principal witness against me, the witness on whose oath I was bound over, and who alone could be supposed to know whether the crimes charged were true or not.]

Doct. Ira Daniels was the next witness: He was the editor or proprietor of a newspaper in Springfield, Massachusetts; he was a native of Worthington in that state, studied physic for a short time in that place—went into Virginia, and set up the practice of physic—left there in circumstances *not the most favorable*—returned to Springfield and set up the printing business; had been a Baptist by profession, but had left their communion, and had espoused the cause of Socinianism or deism. He had brought Maria to court, was much in her private company, but knew nothing of the truth of the crimes charged upon me; had never heard of them until between two and three years after they were said to have been committed, but manifested great zeal in supporting the testimony of Maria.

Samuel Wheeler, the negro, was the next witness, and testified as in page 95. By Mr. Goddard.—Did they see you?

Ans. I do not know—they rolled over. But no question was asked him, what year, or time of the year it was; nor how he could distinguish people so as to swear who they were, if they were covered in bed; if that bed was surrounded with curtains, if it was so situated that the head of the bed could not be seen from the door, &c. But admitting this story to be true, it was a very indecent and imprudent act, and that of which every person ought to be ashamed; but does it prove any one crime charged in the information to be true? It certainly does not.

Welcome A. Browning was the next. He, from sectarian principles had become unfriendly to me, and discovered great anxiety to have me condemned. He testified that he lived within about forty rods of Mr. Geer; that he never saw me there but once; that he had frequently seen me going to, and coming from the house, and at the door; that Sam came home one day and told the story which he had just related; and he told him that he must not tell such a story about Mr. Rogers, for he was a minister; and that he should flog him if he did, that Sam told him he might flog him if he was a mind to, but the story was true, and he did not whip him, and that he thought his character for truth and veracity equal to that of black boys in general.

William Foster, Esq. He is a justice of the peace in the town of Union. He testified that about the last of last May, I came to his house with Maria A. Smith; that she there wrote a deposition, signed and made oath to it before him; that on being told to swear to the deposition, she appeared to be agitated; that he was about to caution her, when I broke in upon him by saying that she was a well educated young woman, understoood the nature of an oath, and needed not to be catechised; that I was out of his house several times while she was there, feeding and taking care of my horse, and he had opportunities of speaking to her when I was not present. He did not testify that Maria discovered any unwillingness to testify, or that she suggested to him any thing unfair; she was at his house sometime, and inquired of him for a school, and also for a place where she could live, and go out on the tailoring business.

Ralph Webb was the next witness; he testified that he kept a tavern in Windham, Scotland society; that I came to his house at a late hour in the night, about the first of September, 1819, and staid there; that the next morning, by my request, he sent a boy with a horse and wagon to Capt. William Howard's in Hampton, about five miles, after Asenath C. Smith, and that she came there with him; that he then went after a justice of the peace. and he understood, for he was not present, that she gave her deposition before him;—that she went away from his house that night, and he believed alone.

Mrs. Eunice Howard, testified that about the first of September, 1819, she went to Griswold and brought Asenath C. Smith home with her in a carriage; that it was wholly without my knowledge or agency; that I soon came there in my carriage and had some conversation with Asenath, who appeared to be in trouble; that she went away with me in my carriage, and returned again that night; that the next morning a boy came after her with a wagon; that she packed up her things, put them into the wagon, bid them good by, and went off.

Julia Geer testified, that Asenath C. Smith was at their house in Windham, sometime in May, 1818; that I often called there, staid a little while and went away; that I often passed their house when I went to preach in Hampton, and sometimes called there.

Eunice Willoughby testified that she lived at Webb's tavern at the time I came there and staid, about the first of September, 1819: that she was sweeping the room joining the one where Asenath and I were; and looking through a crack in a swing partition, she saw us; that I had a paper in my hand, and said, Asenath, you must contradict what you testified about this; that she replied, and said, I cannot, and I wish I was dead; that she did not know what it was that I wished to have her contradict, but thought it was what she had testified before Esquire Coit. [It was a copy of the letter which she had written to Capt. Cook, dated August 6th, 1818 which at the binding over she testified was not written by her, and that she knew nothing of it. I now requested her to con

tradict what she had testified concerning that letter ; this she had said so much about, that though she then acknowledged it was her letter, written by her, and it was true ; yet she felt a reluctance at contradicting what she had testified on that point, and I said no more to her on it.]

Warren Williams, testified that in the month of January, 1820, Maria A. Smith worked at his house in Groton, as a hired girl ; that Mr. Willoughby came there and summoned her in my behalf, to appear in court, in Norwich, and testify what she knew in my case ; that he gave her a silver dollar, and that she, with seeming reluctance, went with him.

Lydia Williams testified, that one Sunday evening in January, 1820, Maria A. Smith was at her house in Groton ; that I came there just at dark, and wished to speak with her, and that she went out of the house with me.

Capt. Ephriam M Williams of Groton, testified, that he lived in the same house with the last witness, who was his mother, and that he could testify to no more than what she had.

Here the evidence on the part of the state was closed for the present, *and no one crime charged in the information was proved or even attempted to be proved by any one witness.* Even the presumptive proof was founded principally on the testimony of Maria A. Smith, who began her testimony by solemnly swearing that she had told so many different stories, and had contradicted herself so often on the subject, that she herself did not think her testimony would be received ; and Sam Wheeler, the negro, whose master declared that he could not believe him when he was sent on a common errand ; poor evidence to destroy a respectable clergyman, who had 2000 souls under his care ; and against whom the wardens of the church in Hebron made solemn oath, that for six years last past they had not known, or so much as heard of a voice or a vote against him, except one man. If I had been a federal presbyterian minister, should I have been condemned in this way and on such testimony ? !

THE COURT DIRECTED MY COUNSEL TO BRING FORWARD THEIR WITNESSES.

James Cook, Esq. Messrs. Enoch Baker, Peleg Fry, Seth Collins, Esq. Capt. John Townsend, and Mr. Shipman Haughton, were sworn.

James Cook, Esq. was the first witness on the part of the accused. He is a Justice of the Peace, one of the Selectmen of the town of Preston, has been several times a member of the General Assembly, one of the vestrymen of Saint James' church in Poquatanic; a man whose truth and veracity and moral character is as unimpeachable as that of any other man in the state. He testified the same as in page 96, and the same as Mr. Rose page 97. That they went to the house of Elisha Geer, when both families, viz. Mrs Smith's and Geer, and Mr. Perry Clark's, came together; that they informed them that they were a committee to inquire into the reports concerning Mr. Rogers and Asenath. By the Judge. —What Reports? Ans. The charges which are now against him: and they informed us that the whole story was a lie; that Mr. Rogers had never been there courting, but only as a clergyman and a friend, and that they were always glad to see him; they said expressly, that he had never kept private company with Asenath, nor lain with her, &c.; and that they never had any thought or expectation that he would marry her, and absolutely cleared him of every thing improper there. We then took out the certificate, (page 87.) which they all had signed, and read it to them; they said it was signed by them, and it was true, clearing him of any improper conduct there; and they said that they could then say no more nor less than what it contained. Mr. Geer, Mrs. Smith. Maria, Asenath, and Mr. Clark and his family, were present; and all agreed to it. We then went to Mr. Browning's and made our business known to them, and he and his wife fully cleared Mr. Rogers of every improper act so far as they knew. We informed them, that we understood that their negro had said that he had seen Mr. Rogers and Asenath in bed together. Mr. Browning said that his negro *was a poor, lying, good for-nothing fellow*, that he could not believe him when he was sent on a common errand, and that he placed no confidence in

his story ; [here Browning who had before been sworn to tell the whole truth, contradicted the witness and declared that he had never said so ; *but it can be proved by three respectable men, who were present, that he did say these words.*] We then went to Ebenezer Clark's and made the same inquiry, and they all declared they knew no hurt of Mr. Rogers, and nothing of the truth of the reports ; and we reported that they were wholly without any foundation in truth, and ought not to be regarded. On the Saturday night before the first Sunday in May. 1818, when Maria testified that Mr. Rogers came there in the night and advised Asenath to go away, I met him at Preston city ; it rained hard and he went home with me and staid ; it was an unusually dark, rainy and windy night ; we set up until half past 11 o'clock ; Mr. Rogers left his hat, whip, boots, great-coat, and saddle bags, in the room where I and my wife lay ; in the morning they were where he left them ; and I was up and foddered his horse before sunrise, and I did not observe that he was wet or had been moved ; my wife said she was unwell and had not been lost in sleep all night ; and under these circumstances I do not think it possible for Mr. Rogers to get up at that late hour in the night, and at that season of the year. and pass through three doors. one of which opened very hard, go eight miles, stay two or three hours, return, put out his horse, come into the house and go to bed again, within eight feet of where I and my wife lay, and no body know it or suspect it. [And I ask, what could any man, who lay in a bed and in a room alone, prove more than this ? and if this important part of her testimony be false, the jury and the public ought to consider the other parts to be false also.] By Mr. Lanman.—Was this Saturday night ? Ans. Yes. sir. By the same.—Did you come from Preston city with Rogers on that evening ? Ans. I did. Did you not have conversation with him, with regard to the complaint which Col. Halsey had caused to be made against Asenath ? Ans. I did. I told him I understood that there was such a complaint, and in conversation on the stories raised by Halsey and Downer, he said he did not see how they could implicate him.

Here I, Ammi Rogers, said—May it please the court, there

were important papers and documents delivered in evidence, to the Justice by whom I was bound over, *they are necessary in my defence ;* and turning to Esq. Coit, said to him, I wish you to return them to me. He replied. I shall not give them up without the order of the court. I then said to the Judge, I wish that the court would please to order them to be given up, *for they are necessary in my defence.* The Judge replied, I do not know that I have power to order. but I advise you to return them. He answered, *I have not got them ;* then turning to Mr. Lanman said, have you not got them ? Mr. Lanman, looking over a bundle of papers, said, *I did not take them.* The Judge said, well. proceed in the trial ; bring on your next witness. *I thought it hard, very hard, and unjust ; but could not help myself; and I now request the reader to turn to page* 99, *see the documents laid before the Justice at the binding over ;* say, if they be not the undeniable evidence of my innocence, if they be not necessary to shew the falsity of the testimony now brought against me, if they be not absolutely necessary in my defence, if it were just and fair to proceed in the trial while they were withheld and concealed ! Who might not be condemned, imprisoned, ruined, executed in this way ?

Mr. Enoch Baker was the next witness ; he testified as in page 98 ; and that they all fully cleared Mr. Rogers of every thing improper there, and said that he had never courted Asenath nor kept her company ; that she never had been like to have a child by him and lost it, and that the whole story was a lie, and that the certificate which they had signed and given clearing him of all improper conduct, *was true.* By Mr. Lanman.—Was this committee appointed at the request of Mr. Rogers ? Ans. It was. By the same. Did he go to Mr. Geer's with you and Mr. Fry ? Ans. He did not: I do not know that he was in that part of the state at the time, or knew any thing of our going there then. By the same.—Did you see Maria at that time ? I do not recollect particularly that I did, but some time after Mr. Rogers was bound over, she came to my house and wished to speak with me alone and in confidence ; I went into another room with her, and after some conversation, she told me that what she had testified before

Esq. Coit, against Mr. Rogers, *was all a lie*, and she never should say it again.

Mr Peleg Fry was one of the vestry of the church in Jewitt city, and a committee with Mr. Baker. He testified that Mr. Baker and he went to Mr. Geer's and Mr. Browning's to inquire, &c. and that they did inquire as Mr. Baker had stated, and that he had represented the information which they had received as it was; that Mrs. Browning in particular, said that she was at Mr. Geer's on the night when Asenath was said to have been delivered, and assisted, and had the means of knowledge, and said it was all a lie.

Samuel Johnson, Esq. was called, but it being late at night, he did not testify; and the court adjourned. Mr. Johnson had come from Massachusetts in an expectation that no collateral testimony would be admitted, until the main facts charged were first proved; but the court overruled, Asenath was not called upon to testify, and his testimony was not necessary.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6th, 1820.

Capt. John Townsend testified, that Maria A. Smith came to his house sometime last February, and called her name Betsey Payne; she said she wanted to stay there a few days, till she could get an opportunity of going to Hartford; but he soon found her real name was Maria A. Smith; that she told him what she had testified before Esq. Coit against Mr. Rogers *was not true:* that she could not in conscience say it again, for she had never seen or known any improper conduct of Mr. Rogers, and had no reason to think that the charges against him were true; that if she did not testify as she did before, she should be prosecuted for perjury; if she did she should perjure herself again and condemn the innocent, and for that reason she wanted to get out of the state; that she was very sorry for what she had done and wanted to get away; that she was very fearful all the time that she was at his house that some one would be after her from Norwich. Mr. Willoughby and his wife brought her there; she staid about eight or ten days; her conversation and behaviour were so lascivious with his young man and before his children, that he would not have her in his house. By the court.—Did you in-

form Rogers what Maria said? Ans. I did. By the same. —Was he at your house while she was there? Ans. He was not, to my knowledge; and I have no knowledge or belief that he knew she was coming there, or had been there, until after she was gone.

Joseph R. Willoughby was sworn. He kept a tavern in Norwich, where the court of inquiry was held, and was employed by me to go and summon Maria A. Smith as a witness. He testified that he found her at Mr. Williams' in Groton, and summoned her, and paid her a silver dollar; that she appeared very reluctant and unwilling to go, and wished to speak to him alone; and then informed him that what she had testified before Esq. Coit, at his house, against Mr. Rogers, was not true; and that she could not in conscience say it again, for she had never seen any thing amiss in him, and had no reason to think that the charges against him were true; that if she went to the court and did not testify as she did before, she should be prosecuted and punished for perjury; if she did she should perjure herself again: and what to do she did not know; and seemed to be very much affected. He testified that he felt sorry for her, and advised her to go home with him, and to put to paper what she could in conscience swear to, and he would carry it privately to Messrs. Goddard and Gurley, and let her know what they said, and that it need not be known that she was there. To this she agreed and came home with him, and soon after wrote to Messrs. Goddard and Gurley, and he carried it; that they said it was so contrary to what she had testified before, that she certainly would be liable to prosecution; and this he communicated to Maria, who, from that time appeared determined not to appear at court, but to go away. He advised her to stay until Mr. Roger should return, who all this time had been gone a journey. [Here Mr. Gurley read the letter which Maria had written and offered to swear to before the superior court and which she afterwards copied and swore to before Esquire Foster; see page 110 and 111.] The witness testified that Maria appeared to be very fearful of having it known that she was there and kept herself mostly confined to her chamber, though she eat at the table with his family; that Mr. Spencer

was at his house while Maria was there, and he understood that he had a capias for her; that she left his house in the night, and the next he heard of her she was in Lebanon. By the court.—Was she kept concealed at your house? Ans. She kept her chamber most of the time, and did not wish to have it known that she was there. By the same.—Who paid you for her board? Ans. As I was employed by Mr. Rogers to summon her, I charged her board to him. By the same.—Did you see her after she went from your house? Ans. I carried her to Bascomb's and to Mr. Townsend's.

Miss Mary Ann Willoughby was sworn; she was the daughter of Mr. J. R. Willoughby, a sensible, well educated, respectable, and worthy young woman, about twenty years of age; she testified, that she first saw Maria A. Smith at the binding over in this case; that she afterwards became acquainted with her when she came to her father's house with him, in January, 1820; that she then had considerable conversation with her, and at different times on the case of Mr. Rogers; that she informed her that she had never seen or known any thing amiss or improper in the conduct of Mr. Rogers; that she had no reason to think that the charges against him were true; and that she thought he was a very clever man. The witness asked her, if that were the case, how she came to testify as she did at the binding over? that she then said, that, at that time she took a false oath against him before Esq. Coit, and that old Halsey, Dr. Downer, and Jim Lanman, as she called them, had overpersuaded her, and hired her to do it; and that she was determined not to do it again, and was very anxious that it should not be known that she was there. By Mr. Goddard.—Was this conversation voluntary on the part of Maria? Ans. Yes sir, *entirely so, and she often repeated it;* and she recollected that Maria wrote to Mr. Goddard on the subject; that her father furnished pen, ink and paper; that this was in the absence of Mr. Rogers; and after that, she was anxious to get away, and was very fearful of being found by Mr. Spencer, *for she said he was a cunning devil.* By Mr. Lanman.—Did Rogers put up at your house at this time? Ans. He did: but was absent on a journey and did not return until, I think, the day she went away.

By the same.--Do you know when she went away from your house? Ans. I do not, but it was in the night, and I believe alone.

Mr. Shipman Haughton testified, that Maria A. Smith came to his house in Hebron sometime last February; that he had considerable conversation with her about Mr. Rogers and asked her (when they were alone) *to tell him as a friend and in confidence*, Did Mr. Rogers court or keep private company with your sister? that she replied, he never did. Did you ever see them in bed together, and have you any reason to think that the child which your sister was like to have was by him? that she answered, I have once said it, but I shall never say it again. He then asked her to tell him candidly if it was true? that she then declared, that it was not true; that she had never seen Mr. Rogers in bed with her sister, and that she had no reason to think that the child was his; that she had often seen George Downer in bed with her, and she had every reason to believe the child was his; and that it was nothing but a plan and a plot of old Halsey, Dr. Downer and James Lanman, to charge it falsely upon Mr. Rogers, to ruin and drive him off, and to clear George. They have once overpersuaded and hired me, said she, to take a false oath against him, and I never should have done it had it not been for them, but I never shall say it again; and for that reason she appeared very anxious to get out of the state, and that it should not be known where she was. By Mr. Goddard.—Have you seen Maria since you came to town? Ans. Last evening, Esq. Collins and I went into Frink's tavern, where she stays, to see her, and to hear what she would say; it was dark when we went in, and Maria was talking with Col. Halsey, and appeared to be very angry, and reproached him for having led her into that scrape, and said she never should have said and done as she did, if it had not been for him; at this time some one came in and brought a light, which interrupted the conversation. Questions by Mr. Lanman, who seemed very much mortified at the testimony of this witness, and determined to cramp him, which were entirely irrelevent and which I do not think proper to repeat.

Seth Collins, Esq. sworn. He testified that he went with

Mr. Haughton the last evening and heard and knew that to be true. which he had testified, respecting what Maria had said to Col. Halsey ; that he heard her tell Col. Halsey only last evening, if it had not been for the coaxing and flattering of him and Dr. Downer, she never should have been in that unhappy scrape, and blamed them very much for their conduct.

Witnesses on the part of the State called again.

Maria A. Smith testified, that it was true that she said to Col. Halsey last night what Esq. Collins and Mr. Haughton had testified; that the testimony of Mary Ann Willoughby and her father, of Capt Townsend, Mr. Haughton, Esq. Cook, and all my witnesses was true, but evaded the force of it by testifying that it was in compliance with my wishes and by my direction! In the other case she made solemn oath before Denison Palmer, Esq. William Foster, Esq. and offered to swear before the superior court, when I was not within fifty miles of her, that she had been overpersuaded and hired by old Halsey, Dr. Downer, and James Lanman to take a false oath against me when I was bound over; that she could not conscienciously say it again, and that she had done it in compliance with their wishes, and by their direction. This is the amount of what she testified, of what she said, and of what she offered to testify. This she charged upon them, this she charged upon me, and this she now since the trial charges upon them again; and ought any man to be implicated in any way by such a witness as this? Since the trial she has confessed before witnesses, *that her testimony against me before the court, on trial, was a lie, and said, that a lie never had choaked her, and did not choak her then.* She testified, when called upon at this time; that what my witnesses had testified that she told them, was true ; that she told them so ; that she did it by my direction ; that when she promised in the swamp to give her deposition, I used no violence with her, and did not threaten her, but she was afraid and was forced on the peril of her life to give it ; that to quiet her conscience I told her that there was no gentleman or Christian who would not do as I had done, and that she could conscientiously contradict her testimony before Esq. Coit, because they charged me with doing these things with force and arms. This is like

her other misrepresentations. I did say, and I say it now; that there is no gentleman or christian, who, if he were falsely accused as I was, who, (if the witnesses would retract, and expose the injustice which was done him. on condition that he would assist them in getting out of the state, and in finding them a place; and if he could not make his innocence appear in any other way) would not do it! To evade what Esquire Cook testified about my being at his house on the night that she testified I came there and advised Asenath to go away, she said that I told her that I came from Esq. Cook's after they were in bed, and was in a great hurry to get back again: before she swore that I staid there two or three hours. By Mr. Lanman.—Have you ever seen your sister and the prisoner at the bar in bed together? Ans. Yes, I have seen them in bed together frequently, and have reproved my sister for it. [*Oh! how false, how shameful.*] By Mr. Lanman.—When you went to South Brimfield, did you sleep with your sister? Ans. I slept with Mrs. Shaw in a chamber, my sister slept in a bed-room in the north part of the house. and Mr. Rogers slept in the south part of the house. Mr. Goddard said, are we trying the Queen here? Mr. Lanman said no, but there appear to be some Italian witnesses here. Mr. Shaw was from home and his wife wished one of the girls to sleep with her. Maria offered her service, and said she was not going to sleep in a strange house alone, she would sleep with Mrs. Shaw, and Asenath might sleep where she always did. She testified that I directed her to call her name Betsey Clark and Betsey Payne. Since the trial she confessed in the presence of Capt. Ephriam M. Williams and others in Groton, that I never did direct her to call herself by these names; that she did it of her own accord, and without the advice or direction of any one.

Welcome A. Browning was called again. He testified that he never told Esq. Cook that his negro was a great liar, and that he could not believe him when he was sent on a common errand. Mr. Peleg Rose, a man of as good character. and of as much truth and veracity as Welcome A. Browning, made solemn oath. that said Browning declared to him, and to James Cook, Esq. that his said negro "was a poor, lying, good-

for-nothing fellow; that he could not believe him when he was sent on a common errand, and that he placed no confidence in his story." Browning testified that he lived near neighbor to Maria A. Smith, and that he knew nothing against her character.

Elias Brewster testified, that he lived in the neighborhood of Sam and Maria; that he did not consider him entitled to the first credit; he did not know but he might be entitled to as much credit as such black boys in general; that he did not personally know any thing against the character of Maria and did not know but it was as good as people's in general as to truth. From her own testimony then before the court, viz. *that she had told so many different stories, and had contradicted herself so often on the subject*, that she herself did not think her testimony would be received--one would think that any further testimony to prove her want of truth would be unnecessary.

John C. Baker testified, that I boarded at his father's in 1819; that I discovered an anxiety to see Asenath, and said if I could see her, I did not doubt but she would tell the truth, and expose the plot which had been formed against me; that I said I would give a considerable to see her and talk with her, but that I never had that privilege to his knowledge, until after she went from Griswold. By Mr. Lanman.—How far did your father live from Asenath? Ans. I should think it was about two miles, as the road runs to widow Lester's, where she was.

Mr. Lanman said, may it please the court--I deem it my duty to call on Col. Halsey, who is associated with me in this case, as a witness.

The court directed him to be sworn.

Jeremiah Halsey, Esq. testified, that on the 11th day of October, 1818, he went to Elisha Geer's and I came there.--[This is false, the 11th day of October, 1818, was Sunday, and I preached in Hebron, and had not been in Griswold for more than a week; the 11th day of October, 1817, was Saturday, and I was in Hebron, and on that day agreed with Mr. Bial Bliss to keep my horse, the next day was Sunday, and I preached in Hebron, and had not been in Griswold for more

than a week.] He testified that I then and there denied that I ever had courted Asenath C. Smith; that he never influenced Maria or her sister in any part of this case, any further than to promote public justice. He testified that Maria had always told the same story, that she had then sworn to; some one motioned to him to set down, for the court, and almost all present had heard her confess how many different stories she had told, and how she had contradicted herself on the subject.

Mr. Lanman then moved to prove what Asenath had sworn at the binding over, on the ground that it went to corroborate the testimony of Maria. To this Mr. Goddard objected, and informed the court that Asenath was then in town, and could testify for herself. The court did not direct Mr. Lanman to have her brought and examined as a witness, but decided that it was not admissible to prove what she had said when she was there, and could speak for herself.

Doct. Downing was called again, and testified that from the putrified state of the fœtus, he could give no particular description of it; he should think it might have been twelve or fourteen inches long, &c. it might have been alive a short time before, and that he never knew a woman to have hysterics when she was pregnant.

Doct. Daniels was called again, and testified that he had practised physic about nine years, and had attended about eleven hundred cases of midwifery, [*a large story! I suppose in Virginia!!*] that he never had seen a case of this kind, nor a case where violence had been used to destroy a fœtus; he should suppose if injury had been done, it would have produced this effect from the time that Mr. Rogers was said to be shut up with Asenath to the time she was delivered.

Doct. Archibald Mercer, sworn. Mr. Lanman had given to Maria a paper folded up with something in it; and he beckoned to her to give it to him before the court and jury without saying a word; and he opened and gave it to the Doctor, saying, Do you believe that to be ergot? [This certainly was one of the greatest acts of injustice and abuse that ever was practised upon any man, in any country; there was no pretence of evidence, and it was not true that I ever saw that

stuff before, or that I ever had it in my possession: or that I ever saw, and had in my possession any thing like it; might he not as well [*to prejudice the jury.*] have brought into court a case of surgical instruments, or an apothecary's shop, and had them examined? I do complain of abuse and injustice, and I appeal to the whole world, if I have not reason to complain? Where is there a man or a woman on earth who would not complain of abuse and injustice, if they were treated in this manner?] The Doctor testified that he thought the paper contained a mixture of ergot and cantharides. By Lanman. —If violence is used to produce an abortion, how long would it be before it took place? Ans. Sometimes immediately, or within a few hours, seldom longer than forty-eight hours.

Doctor Nathaniel S. Perkins, sworn; he testified that the paper contained ergot and cantharides, and agreed with Doct. Mercer, and then the testimony on both sides was closed; and I have represented it fully, and fairly, against me, and for me, as it related to this case, and as it was then delivered in court, on trial, (if it can be called a trial) on the information, according to my best recollection, and according to my journal written at that time. No one crime charged upon me in the information was true, nor proved, nor ever attempted to be proved by any witness whatever. I appeal to every juryman, I appeal to every person in the world to say, if from the evidence then delivered in court, any one crime charged in the information against me, was proved by any witness whatever; turn to the information, and then examine the testimony; who testified there in the trial before the court, that I had ever begotten Asenath C. Smith with child at any time? or that I ever did produce in her an abortion, or use any means with her for that purpose; *or that an abortion ever was produced in her by any one?*— After all this smoke, noise, and trial, what evidence was there before the court that any crime had been committed with her by any one?

COUNSEL.

Col. Halsey, in a very awkward, clumsy manner, got up and opened the argument, by endeavouring to apologize for Maria and the negro, and to make it appear that they ought

to be believed; and although it did not prove the facts charged in the information, yet it proved something; and then taking it for granted that the charges were true, he undertook, without logic, rhetoric, or elegance, to describe the enormity of the crimes charged; when he himself had been accused of more adultery, of more seduction, and of more fornication and debauchery than any man who ever lived in Preston; and I appeal to every person, man or woman, in that town, for the truth of what I say.

Mr. Cleaveland then arose, and in a smooth, easy address, attempted to show that no crime charged in the information had been proved by any witness then adduced in court, and recapitulated the testimony, and said that there was no evidence before the court that I ever had been informed, or did know that the said Asenath was, or had been like to have a child by any person, until long after the supposed abortion; that here was no evidence before the court that I ever had at any time, or in any way produced, or caused to be produced in the said Asenath an abortion, or that I had at any time used with her any means whatever for that purpose, or with that intent; *or that an abortion ever was produced in her by any person at any time.* That the Doctor himself, who delivered, and who seemed in favour of the prosecution, had testified, and it was in evidence before the court, that he saw no marks of violence upon the child, [*if it was one.*] or upon the mother, and that it might have been produced by sickness, by accident, or by infirmity; and he took it upon himself to say, that there was no evidence before the court that it was not produced in that way. He then shewed the improbability of the truth of Maria's testimony. Would any mother, would any decent family, would Mr. Perry Clark and his family, have suffered any man to be shut up alone, night and day in a chamber, with fastened doors, and none of the family admitted into the room, with this young woman, from Tuesday till Saturday, and no one say a word against it? Would a mother have heard the dreadful shriek which Maria had described, gone to the chamber, found it fastened, obtained admittance, seen her daughter lying on a bed, and Mr. Rogers standing and holding a sheet over her face, saying she had

got the hysterics, and he would take care of her, then go down and leave them, all that night, all the next day, and all the next night? the story is a lie in itself! no mother on earth would suffer such a thing, no family would permit it; and after all, the mother and Maria herself, and all the family did, to Mr. Baker and Mr. Fry, in one instance, and to Esquire Cook and Mr. Rose, in another instance, solemnly declare that they knew no impropriety of conduct in Mr. Rogers; that he had never been there courting, but only as a clergyman and a friend; that they never had any expectation that he would marry the young woman; and after all, Maria has volunteered her service, and come from Massachusetts, for she was not obliged to come, to testify these disgraceful things against her sister, and in the very act of doing it, has sworn that she herself has told so many different stories, and has contradicted herself so often on the subject, that she herself did not think her testimony would be received: astonishing impudence! unspeakable depravity! and are our courts of law to be insulted in this way? will the jury place any confidence in a witness of this cast? [*O Dii immortales! ubinam gentium sumus! quam Rempublicam habemus!*] i. e. O, Immortal Gods! what nation are we? what republic have we? No man ought to be condemned or acquitted on the testimony of such a witness; and take away her testimony, what is there against my client? The testimony of Sam the negro, if true, proves improper conduct, but does not prove the charges in the information. But the question is, whether it is to be believed; Esq. Cook, testifies that his master said he was a poor, lying, good-for-nothing fellow, and that he could not believe him when he was sent on a common errand—a fine witness to be brought before the Superior Court to destroy a respectable clergyman. Mr. Brewster, who is brought here on purpose to support his character, swears he does not consider him entitled to the first credit; and is it probable that a clergyman would be seen lying in bed with an unmarried woman in open day light, at sun half an hour high, with the door open, I ask you, gentlemen of the jury, is this probable? Is it true? Well, take away the testimony of Maria and the negro, (which if admitted does not prove any one charge con-

tained in the information,) what is there, I beseech you, against my client As it respects this young woman, Asenath, there is no evidence of the least impropriety of conduct towards her, until many months after the crimes were said to have been committed; and then it is only in assisting the witnesses in getting away. on condition that they should speak the truth and declare his innocence. But this is brought against him in another action, and is not before this court, nor is it any part of the crimes now charged upon him, nor is it yet proved that he did carry away the witnesses. Maria did not leave the state until after the last court, when in her letter to Mr. Goddard, she offered to testify wholly contrary to what she has now testified, and she is now here, Asenath is now in town, ready to testify, and Mr. Lanman has been called upon to bring her forward, which he dare not do; and yet he would prosecute my client for carrying them away.—The testimony on the part of the prisoner is conclusive. The young woman herself, her mother, and Maria herself, her grand father, and uncle Clark, and all the family have, in words and in writing, at different times, and on different occasions, and to different persons and committees, fully cleared him of these crimes now charged upon him,and of every other impropriety of conduct; and never did accuse him until 1819, two years afterwards; this, gentlemen, is in proof before you by the most indubitable testimony, by James Cook, Esq. by Mr. Baker and Mr. Fry. If on the whole, you. gentlemen of the jury, from the evidence now before you, think that the prisoner at the bar is guilty of the crimes charged upon him, in the manner and form stated in the information, you will say so on your oath, and he must suffer the consequence; but if you think that the evidence now delivered in court does not prove that he committed the crimes now charged upon him, and in the manner and form stated in the information, you will say on your oath that he is not guilty, and he will be acquitted with honor. The foregoing are not the words of Mr. Cleaveland, but the substance of what he did say, and of what I think he should have said, if he intended to defend his client.

Mr. Goddard then arose, and addressed the court in a sen-

sible, elegant, and well arranged argument, recapitulating the testimony, and showing the insufficiency of the evidence to prove any one crime in the information, and the sufficiency of the evidence to evince my innocence, drawn from the repeated confessions of Asenath herself, and of the whole family, and the long time before the charges were brought. He insisted on the injustice of admitting the testimony of Maria after the confessions which she had then made in court; and after her letter in her own hand writing, which was proved by Mr. Willoughby and his daughter, to have been written in my absence, was read; in this she confessed that what she had testified in this case before Esq. Coit, she could not in conscience say again that she had no reason to think the charges were true, &c. [*why my counsel did not bring forward her depositions before Denison Palmer, Esq. page* 110, *and before William Foster, Esq. page* 111, *I have never been able to learn.*] Mr. Goddard insisted on it, that there was no evidence that any crime, as charged in the information, had been committed by any one; and until that was first proved, all other testimony was irrelevant. That the testimony of Maria ought not to be admitted in any case, and that the jury ought not to place any confidence in it; he said expressly that no man ought to be condemned on such testimony, and that the negro story carried its own refutation it itself, for that no man in his senses would be seen in that situation; his argument was cool, collected, fair, and dispassionate, and he submitted it to the consciences of the jury to say, if from the evidence then delivered in court, it was proved that any one crime, as charged in the information, had been committed by me; he said, if it was true, *it was not proved;* and he took it, that they ought to render a verdict according to what was then in court proved. If they could in conscience say, from the evidence then delivered in court, that I had committed the crimes charged in the information, they would say I was guilty, and the whole world would say I ought to be punished. But if there was no such proof, and he thought there was not, they would say I was not guilty, and the whole world would say I ought not to be punished. The foregoing are not the words of Mr. Goddard, but the amount of his argument.

Mr. Lanman then arose to close the argument; he was well prepared, and displayed all the art, all the sophistry, and all the ability which he possessed; he had told me in so many words, [*that he was determined to drive me out of the ministry, and out of the state.*] He had been to Elisha Geer's, about eight miles, and closetted with Asenath C. Smith from about two or three o'clock in the afternoon, until nine or ten o'clock at night, and had promised her honor, friendship, protection, secrecy and safety, if she would swear these crimes upon me; she consented and did it; she was then confined and guarded night and day, at the widow Lester's in Griswold, from April till September, when she obtained permission to go to Hampton about 14 miles on a visit, and the very next day went before a justice and made solemn oath that these crimes charged upon me, relative to her where wholly, utterly, and absolutely false and unjust, and that she had been overpersuaded, and wickedly induced to charge them upon me falsely, for which she was then very sorry. She had constantly and uniformly adhered to this, and was then at court, in town, ready and willing to testify the same on trial. Maria had also confessed that she had taken a false oath against me when I was bound over; that old Halsey, Doct. Dowter and James Lanman had overpersuaded and hired her to do it;—she had been before Denison Palmer, Esq. and made solemn oath, when I was not within 30 miles of her; that she had no reason to believe that the charges against me were true, her sister told her soon after the death of her mother, while she was confined at the widow Lester's, that the charges against me were not true; that she was sorry for what she had testified, and was determined not to say it again, and wanted to leave that place. Maria had constantly for about twelve months declared her full belief of my innocence of the crimes charged against me. Mr. Lanman had now got her into his possession again, she had recanted and told her first story and he must now make the best of it. After an apology, and a profession of his pretended feeling, he related the story as it was contrived and laid before the court of inquiry, of a young female, seduced by a clergyman, begotten with child, poisonous portions of ergot administered, a dead-

ly instrument used, the child destroyed in embryo, she languishing, sickening, dying; (not one word of which was then in proof before the court, not one word of it was true.) O, that he was made of a stronger texture! O, that his nerves were iron! In this way he arrested the attention of all who were present: he weeps, he sobs, he wipes his eyes, and appeals to the feelings of humanity, he appeals to the paternal affection of every parent present, to the feelings of every mother, of every brother, of every sister in the world. The jury are all in tears, the judge himself weeps, and not a heart which does not burn with indignation against the wretch who would do these things; they forget the testimony, they are ready to catch at every straw, they are ready to believe any thing; the testimony of Maria is then recapitulated and dressed in the most glaring colours, the negro story is repeated; the hesitancy which was observed by Esq. Foster is brought up and enlarged upon, and the swamp story, the dismal swamp story, horrabile dictu! et amplius mirabile visu! that is, *horrible to be told, and more horrible to be seen*, was portrayed in the gloom of death. In fact it appeared to me that Mr. Lanman exerted himself in every way to answer his purpose. To beat, to come off conqueror, in this case, would gratify the feelings of all my political, religious and personal enemies; of them he would reap the plaudit, well done; he would reap fame, honor, renown! to be conquered, he would be despised by all. Towards the close of his plea, he wished to introduce Maria before the court again, and it is thought that she understood the case. He stated something which he said she testified about my coming there in the night and advising Asenath to go away; my counsel objected, and said she did not say so. This afforded the opportunity he wanted of calling her again before the court. The case rested almost wholly on her testimony, and he closed with a few remarks, that although there was no direct proof of the crimes charged upon me, yet the circumstances were sufficient to convince every person present that I was guilty, and he expected the jury would find me so. I do not pretend that I have repeated the words of Mr. Lanman, but I have endeavored to represent the manner in which I thought he managed this case; that he raised a frightful and pitiful im-

age, which did not exist in truth or in evidence, that he mourned and cried over it himself, that he called forth the sympathy and compassion of the court and jury, and excited a high indignation whereby they were ready to believe any thing, and to punish the least appearance of guilt in this case, and to construe circumstances into the appearance of guilt where there was none.

So soon as the pleadings were closed, I said,

May it please the court—I stand here accused of crimes, which never came into my mind, at which my heart revolts, which are disgraceful and shocking to humanity; and of which, Sir, I am absolutely as innocent as your honor the judge, or as either of you, gentlemen of the jury. The person, on whose oath I was bound over for trial and on whose oath I ought to be condemned or acquitted, the only person in the world who can be supposed to know and testify whether the crimes charged upon me be true or false, is now in town, and is ready and willing to testify my entire innocence, and to explain every circumstance on which even a presumption of guilt can rest upon me, and I now move that her testimony may be admitted and heard. By the judge—Where is she? Ans. Within a few rods of this place, and can be here in a very few moments. By the same—Why have you not offered her before! Ans. Because she was not my witness, but the principal witness on the part of the prosecution, and I did suppose that the court would require the highest evidence in the case, and that she must and would be called upon by the State's Attorney; in that case she would have disclosed the whole plan and the means used to effect it. By the judge—I do not know, it is a novel case, you have had a hearing of two days, and you have had an opportunity of bringing her forward. Ans. And so has Mr. Lanman: if he had brought her forward, she could have told the whole truth and he could not have contradicted it. If I had brought her forward, he could have proved what she was induced to testify at the binding over, and I could not impeach or contradict my own witness: and, sir, in this way I am deprived of the constitutional right of confronting the principal witness against me.—By the judge, to Mr. Cleaveland—Have you any thing to say

on this subject? Ans. The counsel for Mr. Rogers have advised him not to bring her forward, but I should be sorry to have his interest suffer by the advice of his counsel. By the judge, to Mr. Isham—I see that Mr. Lanman is absent, and you have been employed in this case. what do you say to this application? Ans. I am confident if Mr. Lanman were present, he would object to it; and in his absence I do object. By the judge—She cannot be admitted. I then replied—I shall think it very hard to be condemned with the undeniable and irresistible evidence of my innocence by my side, ready and willing to testify, but rejected by the court merely because she was not offered a little sooner. Mr. Lanman introduced Maria to testify after my counsel had closed their pleadings. By the judge—you have had an opportunity of two days to bring her forward, you have not done it, and she cannot now be admitted This is the substance, and in many respects, the very words, which passed between me and the judge at this time. He had before admitted collateral testimony before the main facts charged were proved. He had refused to send for Lester Clark, who would have destroyed the testimony of Maria A. Smith, on which I was condemned; he had directed them to proceed in the trial while the papers and documents, which were delivered in evidence to the justice at the binding over, were withheld and concealed. And he now proceeded to charge the jury in a manner, which I appeal to a candid and enlightened public to say, if it was not highly objectionable.

The Judge then arose and said.

Gentlemen of the Jury—The prisoner at the bar stands charged in the information, which you have heard read to you.with a high crime and misdemeanor. To this information he has plead *not guilty*, and has put himself on his country, which country you are. *for trial;* the case has been managed by able counsel on both sides. It involves no question of law about which it will be necessary for the court to instruct you. You will inquire in the first place, if there has been a premature birth; in the second place, if it were produced by violence; and in the third place, if it was caused or done by the prisoner. If from the evidence which you have heard, you

are satisfied that he is guilty—[*he did not say guilty of the crimes charged in the information, on the first day of July*, 1817, *and on the first day of November*, 1817,] you will say that he is guilty. But if you are satisfied that he is not guilty, you will say he is not guilty. It is now late at night, and this court will now be adjourned to 8 o'clock to-morrow morning.

These were the words of the charge so near as I can recollect, and certainly the substance of it; and I appeal to every person in the world, if it were not diverting the attention of the jury from the information, and placing it on the testimony of Maria A. Smith. There was no pretence of proof, except Maria, and her testimony in the minds of the court and jury ought at least to have been very doubtful, if not absolutely false; *she certainly could not be said to be a person of undoubted truth.*

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7th, 1820.

The court met according to adjournment; the jury at about eleven o'clock came in; I was called, and the jury were called over, and were asked if they had found a verdict; the foreman answered, they had; the clerk asked, guilty or not guilty? He answered, guilty. Mr. Goddard then moved for a new trial, on the ground that there was no evidence that the crimes charged in the information had ever been committed by any person; on the ground that there was no proof against me, which ought to be regarded. In both cases the court overruled, and would not grant a new trial. I did expect that he would have moved for a new trial on the ground that important documents had been withheld and concealed; on the ground that Mr. Perry Clark and his wife were out of the state and their testimony could not be had; on the ground that I had been deprived of the constitutional right of confronting the principal witness against me, and of compulsory process to obtain a witness necessary in my defence. He did take exceptions to the words of the information, but here again the judge overruled.

The court adjourned till one o'clock, then to meet at the Judge's chamber at Shepherd's hotel. At one o'clock the court was called in the Judge's chamber. I appeared. The Judge said, you stand charged with a most heinous offence;

the jury have declared you guilty. It now devolves upon me to pronounce the sentence; this is a matter of discretion with the court. I understand that you have children who are well educated and respectable, and I am inclined to mercy so far as is consistent with the welfare of society. The sentence of the court therefore is, *that you be imprisoned in Norwich Jail, without bail or mainprize, for the term of two years.* Lanman standing by, exulting and triumphing over his unfortunate and distressed victim, said to the Judge, I suppose you mean Newgate; but the Judge, who had been counsel against me in the county of Fairfield, had opposed me in the convention of the Episcopal church, and was considered by me as my personal, political and religious enemy, and who in this very case I considered as having acted very unfairly, was yet more merciful, and said, *no*, I mean Norwich.

I then addressed the court in these words: I thank the court for shewing some degree of mercy, when it was in your power to have gone farther; but that God, who knows the hearts of all men, knows that I am as innocent of the crimes charged upon me, as your Honor the Judge, or as either of the gentlemen of the jury, who have declared me guilty. I think that they have been misled, and have declared me guilty without evidence, and I know without truth. From the sentence now pronounced upon me, I appeal to the righteous tribunal of Heaven, there you and I must appear and then it will be known that you have *condemned the innocent*, and that I suffer *unjustly*. In the mean time, I submit myself to every insult, to every abuse, and to every injustice, which can be loaded upon me. Much better men than any of us have suffered before me!

I settled my business at the tavern where I and my witnesses put up committed my horse and carriage to the care of my good friend Seth Collins, Esq. got into a waggon with a Mr. Reed, was accompanied by a deputy sheriff, went to Norwich, about 13 miles, gave myself up to the Jailor, and was locked up, where I remained 731 days, without ever putting my foot on the ground, having the compassion of my friends, and suffering the insults and abuse of my enemies.

Here I am, who have received the honors of one of the first

universities in America, who was ordained in Trinity church in the city of New-York, constantly a member of the convention of the Episcopal church in that state, three years a member of the general convention of the Episcopal church in the United States, who have preached with approbation in all the principal towns and cities in the northern and eastern states, who have enjoyed all the honors and degrees of freemasonry, who am a member of the corporation of Union College in the city of Schenectady, and was one of its first founders; who was settled as a minister in my native town and state, without so much as one dissenting voice or vote; who have performed more ministerial duties than almost any other clergyman in the United States, who have always endeavored to give the best instructions, and set the best example in my power, and to have always a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man! Because I thought it best for the Episcopalians to unite with the Republicans of Connecticut and vote for Col. Kirby to be Governor, and to do away the offensive presbyterian laws of the state, and that all mankind should enjoy equal civil and religious rights and privileges according to their several capacities and stations, I was forbid to preach in the state, without hearing or trial, and actually without my knowledge; but which prohibition was afterwards declared and pronounced *to be without authority and void*, both by civil and ecclesiastical authority. I was sued nine times for not regarding that prohibition, was persecuted for more than seven long years in Fairfield county, I was robbed of my testimony, (*see Mr. Leeds' letter, page* 54,) the Journal of the House of Bishops, in 1808, was altered and forged, and they were represented as saying and doing that to my particular disadvantage, which they never did say or do, and that which they did determine, in my favor, was wholly misrepresented (*see page* 63;) official information was given to the church against me, which was wholly false, (*see page* 56,) I was refused a seat in the convention of my own church in the state, though they acknowledged and confessed that they had nothing against me, that my character and authority were good, see page 40, but I was a republican in principle, I was opposed to a union of church and state, *and*

had offered to change the laws and customs of the state, in taxing every body to support the Presbyterians, unless they would acknowledge themselves dissenters. These were my real crimes! Had I been a federal Presbyterian minister, my character would have been shielded, my person defended, from all prosecution; yea, the plotters and abettors of this unparallelled persecution held up to everlasting contempt. But the Judge himself, on my trial, had been employed as a lawyer against me, for many years in the county of Fairfield, and for almost 20 years had been one of my principal opposers—was prejudiced against me, and not fit to judge a case where I was concerned, if only one dollar was depending, much less where character, profession, liberty and every thing valuable in life was at stake. My counsel did not defend me and my cause as I expected, and as they might have done!! Bishop Hobart had neglected and insulted me, and about four thousand people! a combination was formed against me, I am accused of crimes which God knows never came into my mind: on trial I was refused the constitutional right of confronting the principal witness against me; the court refused to send for a witness in my favor, important papers and documents, the undeniable evidence of my innocence, were on trial withheld and concealed, and the court proceeded without them; the judge did not charge the jury on the information, as I thought he ought to have done; they declared me guilty on the testimony of a witness who had repeatedly confessed that she had taken a false oath against me and who then in court swore and testified, *that she had told so many different stories, and had contradicted herself so often on the subject, that she did not think her testimony would be received.* The court refused a new trial, overruled all objections of my counsel, pronounced on me a sentence of two years imprisonment in Norwich jail, and here I am in affliction, in disgrace, and in misery.

O, Father of mercies and God of all comfort, my only help in time of need; look down from Heaven I humbly beseech thee, behold, visit and relieve thy persecuted and afflicted servant; look upon me with the eyes of thy mercy, comfort me with a sense of thy goodness, preserve me from

the temptations of the enemy, give me patience and resignation under my sufferings. O, that no repining thought may enter my heart to discompose me in my duty towards thee my God, or towards my fellow men; be pleased to forgive my enemies, persecutors and slanderers, and to turn their hearts; and, O God, who spareth when we deserve punishment, and in the midst of thy wrath rememberest mercy, I humbly beseech thee of thy great goodness to comfort and succour me and all others who are under reproach and misery in this or in any other house of bondage; correct us not in thine anger, neither chasten us in thy sore displeasure; give us a right understanding of ourselves, and of thy threats and promises; that we may neither cast away our confidence in thee, nor place it any where but in thee. Be pleased to relieve the distressed in this and in all other places wherever they may be; protect the innocent and make their innocency to appear; awaken the guilty, convert the unconverted, and fill the world with thy glory. And, forasmuch as thou alone canst bring light out of darkness, and good out of evil, grant that the pains and punishments which we thy servants endure, through our bodily confinement, may tend to the setting free of our souls from the chains of sin, that when this mortal life shall be ended, we may dwell with thee in life everlasting—all which I ask in the name and through the merits of thy blessed son Jesus Christ, our Lord, who for my sake became despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, and who hath taught and commanded me that when I prayed, I should say, Our Father who art in heaven, &c.

For about ten years I had been a settled minister in a county town, and had thought it my duty to visit those who were in prison, and to comfort the afflicted. It was not my business to add to the sentence of the law, and to neglect or afflict the afflicted; it was enough for me to know that they were sick or in prison; I knew that often the innocent were condemned and the guilty went clear, and it was my delight and my business, like the good Samaritan, to pour the wine and oil of consolation into the wounds of a bleeding heart. Often have I preached to prisoners in jail; often have I seen

the tears of gratitude flow from the eyes of those who had been edified by my instruction, who had received comfort from my sympathy, relief from my bounty, and consolation from my prayers; but little did I think that I should ever be confined myself; little did I think that I should need those kind offices of love and friendship which I had so often administered to others—"*but he who is on the highest spoke in fortune's wheel may soon be on the lowest, and the wisest knows not how soon.*"

Whoever will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. Our Saviour himself entered not into his glory until he had first suffered here on earth.—Read the 12th chapter of Hebrews—so our way to eternal glory is to suffer patiently here on earth; he was falsely accused, partially and unfairly tried, and unjustly condemned, and not imprisoned only, but executed as a criminal, as a felon. He was said to be not only a gluttonous man and a wine bibber—not only a friend of publicans and sinners—not only guilty of blasphemy, because he made himself God, and equal with God; *but because he thought to change the customs of the country where he lived. He overthrew the tables of the money changers, and said that they had made God's house of prayer a den of thieves.*

The Sheriff was good enough, though very much against the wishes of Lauman, to give me the best room in the jail. The first day after my confinement I had my room thoroughly washed and cleansed. I soon sent for a joiner and had it repaired and shelves put up; it was then whitewashed; a ventiduct was soon put in from the vault to prevent a disagreeable smell. My friend Collins brought me a bed and bedding. I had table cloths and towels sent me—table, and chairs were furnished by the jailer—I purchased table furniture, crockery, glasses, &c.—my trunks and books were brought me—a paper maker sent me half a ream of good writing paper; and I was as comfortable as could be expected. My friends wrote to me from different parts of Connecticut and other states, and offered me any assistance which I should want. I was permitted to have the room entirely to myself; the prisoners seemed solicitous not to hurt my feelings; they were attentive to my daily devotions and religious

instructions ; a change in their moral conduct and conversation was very observable ; no profane, no obscene, no unbecoming language was heard among them. On the night that I was committed to jail, Mr. Baily the jailor, lost his wife by death, who was a woman to whom I had administered baptism in the church at Poquatanic ; her parents and friends belonged to that church, which had for years been in my care ; and she was a very amiable woman. I considered her death a great and sore affliction. But soon, the sense of injustice that was done me, the shock, the disappointment, the mortification, the total change of circumstances, from the very pinnacle of affluence, honor and enjoyment, to a loathsome, lonesome, disgraceful and ignominious jail! Good God! what a change! and the consciousness of my own innocence only added poignancy to my grief: I became sick, very sick, a general debility, a violent pain in my head and eyes, a sickness at my stomach, a fever, and to me and others the approach of death was observable. A Mr. Ives, who had formerly been a merchant of some distinction, was committed on the suspicion of a crime, but of which he was acquitted, begged the privilege of my room, and it was granted. This was about the tenth day after I came here, and he remained with me about four months—during which time I recovered in a great degree my former health. To mention the kindness of one friend would seem to be a neglect of others. The jailer at that time furnished good and wholesome food, and enough of it. The sheriff often called to see the prisoners, and to enquire of their welfare. Mr. Gurley was now state's attorney, and seemed to be sensible of the injustice which was done to me. Mr. Goddard knew that I blamed him, and I have never spoken to him since my trial. I blame him for permitting the trial to proceed, without compelling them to bring forward the principal witness, and while my documents were withheld. Uncommon exertions were made to convince the public that I was guilty and justly condemned ; the newspapers were filled with squibs and misrepresentations. Constance F. Daniels, cousin of Ira Daniels, reported, and Mr. Green of New-London printed a misrepresentation of my trial—setting forth to the public what was proved at the

binding over and a great deal more; and wholly neglecting to shew any thing which I proved, reviling and reproaching me in the most false manner, and with the most abusive epithets!! Illy would it become me to render railing for railing. To the said Daniels I would barely mention the name of the *amiable widow Wade*, lest he should think I intended to retort the same language upon him.

Maria A. Smith, after my trial, returned to Springfield with Ira Daniels. He found that his friends had forsaken him, all his property was attached by his creditors, and he was suffering in some degree the distress which he had been endeavouring to bring unjustly upon me. She then returned to Griswold, despised and neglected by those who would have been her friends; she fled to the city of New-York, where she remained till the summer of 1822, when she returned again to Griswold, *diseased and sick*. After her recovery, she married a poor drunken fellow, by the name of Packer, who has been sick *with the rheumatism in the hips, or thereabouts* most of the time since; and they now live together, in Groton, *very unhappily*, and in less than one year he complained of his wife, to a justice, for the crime of adultery.

Asenath C. Smith, after the court, went home with Esq. Collins to wait for the next superior court in New London county, to be holden in the next January. It was expected that I should then have a trial on the merits of the case in the action brought against me by Lanman for carrying off the witnesses. In this case her testimony would have been very important, and the all-night visit, the private bed-room agreement, and the east chamber conference might have then been exposed: but he had sagacity enough to enter his *nolle prosequi*, and dismiss the suit. I sent my petition to that court for a new trial, but on account of informality, it being not signed by a judge, it was not presented. I petitioned the Honorable General Assembly of Connecticut, in May, 1821, not for the pardon of crimes which I never had committed, but to be liberated from prison, and to have all the records in this case destroyed, on the ground of my entire innocence of the charges; on the ground that no one act charged upon me in the information had been proved by any witness whatever; on the

ground that the testimony of Maria A. Smith, on which I was condemned, and was suffering imprisonment, and the loss of all worldly comforts, was false, and ought not to be believed; on the ground that important witnesses, necessary in my defence were out of the state, and their testimony could not be had; that Jacob B. Gurley, Esq. had declared, that on the testimony of such a witness as Maria A. Smith, no man ought to be condemned; that Calvin Goddard, Esq. had declared, that on such testimony he would not condemn even a dog; that George Hill, Esq. had declared that there was not evidence enough against me on trial to condemn even a cat; — that Benjamin Harris, Esq. of Preston, had declared that he did not think that there was a person in Preston or Griswold, who was acquainted with Maria A. Smith, that would take her word, or her oath for one quarter of a dollar; that the Hon. Judge Williams of Groton, who lived in the neighbourhood of the said Maria, had declared that he did not think that any person who was acquainted with her, ought, or would think the better or the worse of any one in consequence of any thing that she could say or swear; that the first time he ever heard of her she was in a house of ill fame, hugging and kissing a married man, and that if the court and jury had known her character and the circumstances, they never would have declared me guilty, or pronounced sentence upon me.

The petition and documents were referred to a committee, who reported that I have leave to withdraw my petition; and so I must suffer whether it be right or wrong. I employed no counsel, and I thought my innocence was so plain that it was not necessary.

CHAPTER XIII.

To his Excellency Oliver Wolcott, Esq Governor of the state of Connecticut, in Litchfield.

Norwich Jail, January 25th, 1822.

Sir,

Whereas by the tenth section of the fourth article of the

constitution, it is provided, "that the governor shall have power to grant reprieves, after conviction, in all cases, except those of impeachment, until the end of the next session of the General Assembly, and no longer :" Now this is respectfully to request your excellency to reprieve or suspend the sentence pronounced upon the undersigned, until the end of the next session of the General Assembly of this state, in order that he may cause to be laid before that honourable assembly the petition, which he now lays before your excellency, and the very same grounds, facts and representations therein contained, and set forth why it should be granted by them, he now lays before your excellency, why this request of a reprieve or suspension of the sentence against him should be granted. He does not ask a pardon of crimes which he has never committed, but he asks and requests a suspension of the sentence against him : and that he may have time to collect his witnesses, some of whom reside out of the state, and at a distance of some hundred miles ; and that he may have time to prepare and to defend himself in his own person, or by counsel, he humbly prays that the reprieve or suspension of the said sentence may take effect, so soon as is consistent with the judgment and pleasure of your excellency. And he hereby offers any good sufficient and satisfactory bonds and security to any proper authority, should they be required, that unless his petition be granted, he will return and submit himself to the prison again, on or before the time shall expire which may be limited And in complying with this request, your excellency will confer a great favour on one of the most persecuted and injured persons that ever was born in Connecticut.

AMMI ROGERS.

To the Honorable General Assembly of the state of Connecticut, to be holden in the city of New Haven, on the first Wednesday of May, A. D. 1822.

The petition of Ammi Rogers, the undersigned, humbly sheweth, that on the 7th day of October, 1820, he was sentenced by the Honorable Asa Chapman, Esq one of the judges of the superior court of this state, to be imprisoned in the common jail in Norwich, in the county of New London, for the term of two years. That the said sentence was founded

on the charge of crimes said to have been committed with Asenath Caroline Smith, a single woman, in the town of Griswold, in said county, on the first day of July, 1817, and in said Griswold, on or about the first day of November in that same year.

Your petitioner now and hereby humbly prays the Honorable General Assembly to take his case into consideration, and to liberate him from prison, and direct all the records in this case to be destroyed ; or to grant him a new trial before an impartial and unprejudiced tribunal, or to grant him any other relief which their wisdom, their justice, and their goodness may suggest. And this petition is founded on the following grounds, viz. 1st, Because he is wholly and entirely innocent of the crimes charged upon him. 2d, Because no one article of crime charged upon him in the information, was proved by any witness whatever. 3d, Because the circumstantial testimony of Maria A. Smith and Sam, the negro, who were the principal witnesses was false and ought not to be believed. 4th, Because he was deprived on trial of the constitutional right of confronting the principal witness against him, &c. 5th, Because the crimes charged upon him were said to have been committed in 1817, but neither the said Asenath, nor any of the family, ever did in any way or manner, accuse him until 1819 nearly, two years afterwards, but had constantly charged the supposed child upon another person, and claimed that the premature birth was occasioned by sickness, infirmity and accident, &c.

6th. *Because his trial was very partial, unfair, and not in the usual mode of judicial proceeding*, in the following particulars, viz. 1st, The judge himself was the personal, political and religious enemy of the accused, and was prejudiced against him; his personal enemy, because he had been employed for many years, as counsel against him, in a great number of vexatious and unreasonable law suits in the county of Fairfield, and was beaten in every instance, or his client withdrew the suit and paid the cost : see page 50. His political enemy, because, if he was not actually a member of the Hartford convention, he was always an advocate of the Federal politics of Connecticut, whereas your petitioner was al-

ways a friend to the equal rights and privileges of all his fellow citizens as defined and explained by the republicans; his religious enemy, because he had constantly, for almost twenty years, been endeavouring to carry into effect papers issued and published against him without hearing or trial, according to the canons of the Episcopal church in any state; which had been declared by the civil authority of the state, and by the ecclesiastical authority of the Episcopal church in the United States, in their pastoral letter of 1808, to be without authority and void, yet the said judge did go into the conventions of the Episcopal church in Connecticut, and advocate the validity of those papers. Your petitioner appeals to the General Assembly, if it were just and honorable, if it were fair and in the usual mode of judicial proceeding, for such a man to sit as judge in a case of this magnitude? In ordinary cases where only one dollar is depending, a judge or a justice, who is known to be prejudiced against or in favour of either party, would withdraw or be considered as disqualified to act; but here, in a case where more than life is depending, Judge Chapman may exercise official power to gratify personal feeling, than which, nothing can be more unfair, oppressive, tyrannical and unjust. Your petitioner further sheweth, that he thinks he has many strong and good reasons to believe that the prosecution itself was deceitful, being instigated and brought with the ostensible view of punishing wickedness and vice, but with the real occult intention of carrying into effect the aforesaid papers of Bishop Jarvis; for it was not until he had been harrassed and distressed for seven long years in Fairfield county with the most unreasonable and vexatious law suits; it was not until after almost twenty years unavailing attempts were made; it was not until bishop Hobart of New-York, after public notice given in all the newspapers in the state by himself, had neglected and disappointed more than 4000 people in the counties of Tolland, of Windham, and New-London, *in the year* 1817; it was not until after the Rev. Mr. Burhans, Judge Chapman's minister, had written to Elder Amos Reed near Jewitt city, and furnished him with those papers, to engage the Baptists as well as the Presbyterians, in the dreadful work of destroying a clergyman with-

out hearing or trial; it was not until after Col. Halsey had, without examination particular profession or recommendation, been confirmed by Bishop Hobart and had partook of the sacrament, and afterwards had a private conversation with him on the subject of those papers; it was not until after said Halsey had by your petitioner been suspended from the holy communion, for his immoral and scandalous conduct and character; it was not until after Dr. Downer received a visit from one of Bishop Hobart's clergymen from the state of New York; it was not until after the Rev. Mr Blakeslee had visited all the parishes of your petitioner, made the most favorable report, and publicly declared that he did not consider that any thing could grow out of those papers affecting the character or authority of your petitioner; it was not until after one of the clergy declared to Dr. Samuel Simons of Hebron, that he knew of a plan, which was *a secret*, which he was not at liberty *to divulge*, but which would certainly drive your petitioner out of that parish within one year; it was not until after Col. Halsey and Dr. Downer went privately to the house of Elisha Geer, about six or eight miles, and staid all night, took Asenath into a bed room alone, the next morning Halsey dictated and Downer wrote the testimony which they wished her and her sister to give against your petitioner; it was not until after Mr. Lanman went privately to the house of the said Geer, and was closetted alone with the said Asenath, in their east chamber, until nine or ten o'clock at night; it was not until after Halsey and Downer at one time, and Lanman at another, had promised her honor, friends, safety, secrecy and indemnity, if she would charge that supposed child, in 1819, upon your petitioner, which in 1817 she had been like to have by the son of the said Downer, and which she had justly and truly charged upon him; it was not until the plan was formed, the complaint was written, and all things were ready, that your petitioner was informed or did know of the plan of disgrace and ruin which was formed against him; the most profound silence was observed, a favorite justice was selected, the complaint was in the hands of an officer, it was written and dressed in the most horrid and frightful form: it was painted in the deepest, blackest and

most dismal colours; and it came forth, *horrabile visu, et mirabile dicta*, i. e. horrible to be seen, and wonderful to be told; the very form and reading of it was designed to prejudice the minds of the public against your petitioner before he was tried, and he was more than half condemned before he was heard. And he submits the above considerations to the Honorable General Assembly, to decide, if the prosecution itself was not deceitful; instigated with an ostensible view of punishing wickedness and vice, but with the real and occult intention of carrying into effect the aforesaid papers of Bishop Jarvis, calling forth the sword of the civil law to sanction the pretended thunders of the church!

Your petitioner further sheweth, that his trial was partial, unfair, and not in the usual mode of judicial proceeding, in that the court admitted the testimony of Maria A. Smith, after she did, then on trial, make an oath and say, "*I have told so many different stories, and have contradicted myself so often on the subject, that I did not think my testimony would be received.*" After it was proved, and she then acknowledged that she had at different times, and to different persons confessed that she had taken a false oath against your petitioner, when he was bound over; and after it was then proved in court, and was in her own hand writing, that she said she had no reason to think the charges were true. He sheweth that his trial was unconstitutional, in that he was not permitted to have a speedy trial, but was kept under excessive bail more than seventeen months: in that he was put in jeopardy twice for the same supposed offence, in that he was refused the privilege of confronting the principal witness against him, in that he was refused a material witness in his favor, then within the jurisdiction of the court, and within a few miles of the place of trial. He sheweth that his trial was partial, unfair, and not in the usual mode of judicial proceeding, in that the Judge overruled and admitted collateral testimony before the main facts charged were proved; that he proceeded in the trial, after he was informed, and did know, that necessary and important papers and documents, the undeniable evidence of the innocence of the accused, were withheld and concealed. He sheweth, that neither the King

of Prussia, nor the Dey of Algiers, nor the Inquisition of Spain, could do more or worse than to call a man before them, and while the evidence of his innocence was withheld and concealed, to proceed to condemn and punish him. He sheweth that the Judge did not charge the jury to inquire if the crimes were true, as they were charged in the information, but diverting the attention of the jury from that, fixed it upon the false testimony of Maria A. Smith, by directing them to inquire if there had been a premature birth, &c. He sheweth that his trial was partial, unfair, and not in the usual mode of proceeding, in that the court permitted Mr. Lanman *to palm a trick* upon the jury, by causing to be brought in and examined before them, a paper containing ergot and cantharides; whereas there was no proof, nor pretence of proof, nor was it true, that your petitioner ever had it in his possession, or ever saw it before; would any other court have permitted such an imposition! He sheweth that some necessary and important witnesses, whose testimony was necessary in his defence were, by means unknown to him, got out of the state, and others were detained by unavoidable, painful and dangerous sickness, and on his trial, their testimony could not be obtained; and he humbly shews, that he *now has new and important evidence of his innocence* of the crimes for which he is now suffering imprisonment; and on all and each of the before mentioned grounds, facts, and representations, your petitioner humbly prays the Honorable General Assembly to take his case into consideration, and to liberate him from prison, and direct all the records in this case to be destroyed, or to grant him the privilege of a new trial before an impartial and unprejudiced tribunal, or to grant him any other relief, which their wisdom, justice, and goodnes may suggest, and he as in duty bound will ever pray.

AMMI ROGERS.

Dated Norwich Jail, January 25th, 1822.

N. B. The foregoing is the substance, and in very many respects, the very words, of the Petition, which was inclosed to the Governor, with the foregoing letter, and to which I received the following answer, viz.

State of Connecticut, Litchfield, February 11th, 1822.

SIR—

I received, a few days since, your letter dated January 25th, 1822, *with a narrative in the form of a petition*, to the General Assembly of this State, to be convened at New-Haven, on the first Wednesday of May next. Your conscience must have informed you whether this narrative contains a just representation of your case. If it is false, you have greatly aggravated the offence for which you are now suffering imprisonment, and instead of reproaching the court and its officers, you ought penitently to admit that the sentence of the Judge was as mild as he was justifiable in pronouncing. On the contrary, if your narrative be true, if you have not been heard by yourself and counsel, if you have not been confronted by the witnesses against you, if you have been refused compulsory process to obtain witnesses in your favor, if you have not had a public trial by an impartial jury, or have been deprived of your liberty otherwise than by a due course of law, the General Assembly, to whom you address your petition, will examine into your case, and doubtless adjudge thereon in such a manner, as an equal regard to your rights and the laws *and honor of the State* shall require.

By the Constitution of this State, "the Governor has power to reprieve after conviction, in all cases except those of impeachment, until the end of the next session of the General Assembly and no longer." If it is intended that reprieves should be effectual in any other than capital cases, the law ought to provide a mode by which either the persons of offenders may be holden to abide the sentence of the law, in cases where pardons are not granted by the General Assembly, or that suitable forfeitures should be recovered in cases where such reprieved persons are not surrendered. No provision of this nature now exists, and in my opinion, any bond for that purpose would be illegal and void. As the General Assembly alone can grant you relief, it would be useless for me to investigate the truth or falsity of the facts connected with your case. I can therefore only express to you my sincere hope, that truth and justice may prevail. I am, Sir, your most obedient servant, OLIVER WOLCOTT.

To His Excellency Oliver Wolcott, Esq. Governor of Connecticut, in Litchfield.

Norwich Jail, Feb. 20th, 1822.

SIR—

On the 15th instant I had the honor of receiving your favor of the 11th, in answer to my application dated the 26th ultimo, and now pray you not to consider me obtrusive in this reply. My petition contains a plain, *unadorned narrative* of the facts on which it is founded, and I knew no other expedient more respectful, or by which I could so well lay my case before your excellency and the General Assembly, and obtain my request. Had I laid my case open in the form of a remonstrance, or of a complaint, or of an impeachment of individuals, still the facts *must have been narrated*, or they could not have been known. God and my own conscience bear me witness, that my narrative contains a just and true representation of my case. I have no pleasnre in reproaching the court or its officers, and God Almighty forbid that I should do it, any farther forth, than a religious regard to truth and justice compel me. Your exhortation to a repentance of crimes which I never have committed, may be kind in the intention, but certainly is afflictive and grievous in its application. No punishment can be mild which is inflicted on the innocent; and in this case, if the charges were true, to be confined in Norwich Jail, a living spectacle of reproach and disgrace, in the very face and eyes of all my friends and acquaintance, is worse than death or Newgate for life. I can truly say with the Roman orator, "*quam publicam odium nullum supplicium est gravius*:" i. e. than public hatred no punishment can be greater. Had your Excellency been pleased to give advice on a different but true view of the subject, it would have been a great favor. It is a solemn and very interesting truth, that I have been falsely accused, partially and unfairly tried, and unjustly condemned to irretrievable disgrace and ruin, with the undeniable evidence of my innocence, excluded by the court, and cruelly and corruptly withheld and concealed by the States' Attorney, and perjury! the most Heaven daring perjury! a confession of which was then proved and acknowledged in court, was tolerated, and allowed! I mean, that af-

ter it was proved in court, on trial, and Maria A. Smith then acknowledged, that she had frequently and seriously confessed, to different persons and at different times, that she had taken a false oath against me before the Justice when I was bound over, and that she had been overpersuaded and hired to do it, *the court admitted her testimony*, and evidently charged the jury, not on the information then against me, but on her story, which was utterly false by her own repeated acknowledgements, and by other circumstances. It is painful for me to say these things of the judiciary of my native state and where I was educated; but my rights are as dear to me, to my children, and to my friends, as Judge Chapman's or Mr. Lanman's, or the State's can be to them; and I should be under everlasting obligations to the Governor for his advice on this view of the subject.

I am suffering imprisonment, disgrace, and the loss of all worldly comforts, not for committing crimes with Asenath C. Smith—No, Sir, this is not the cause for which I am imprisoned, persecuted, and suffer the loss of all things—but my real crimes, my most heinous sins, are that I have dared to be a Protestant Episcopalian; that I have dared to oppose a union of Church and State; that I have dared to oppose any person's being by law taxed, and by law compelled to attend and pay money, to support that as God's truth which they did not believe to be true; that I have dared to call in question the Federal Presbyterian politics of Connecticut, and to be a Republican; that I had questioned the morality and infallibility of Bishop Jarvis; that I had fully espoused the doctrine, that although Bishops were the true and lawful governors of Christ's church, yet if they did not govern Christ's church according to Christ's laws, and the established order of that church, their government was not binding: that no discipline, no sentence, no administration of Bishop Jarvis, or of all the Bishops in the United States, or of the whole world, is of any force or validity, unless it be founded on the previous steps required by the authority of God's word and the constitution and canons of his church. Another dreadful sin and crime in me is, that I have not any, even the least,

confidence in the *Leather Mitten Ordination*,* under a string of which Mr. Lamman had then recently enrolled himself, or in any other ordination which is derived of human authority. It was then, and now is, my decided opinion, that there is no ecclesiastical authority which is not derived from God, and that there is no civil authority which is not derived from the people. That no one can lawfully baptize, or administer the sacrament, or hold forth to a guilty world the terms of life and salvation in the name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Ghost, without authority from God; and that this authority can be derived only two ways, viz. immediately from Heaven, in an extraordinary manner, and then we must produce immediate and extraordinary works to prove it, such works as no others can produce; for God never requires his creatures to believe that which he has given them no reason

*When our forefathers first came to reside in that part of Connecticut where I was born, a settlement was formed at the mouth of Stratford river. On Sundays they used to meet for public worship, and sometimes one would pray and exhort, and sometimes another, as they felt disposed They drew up a writing among themselves which they called a Church Covenant—they then thought it necessary to have a minister, and what made a minister was the people's choosing him, and his accepting the choice. If they could make a minister they could ordain him, for it was more to make him than it was to ordain him. Accordingly they met and chose one Mr. Chauncy out of their number, who seemed to be the most gifted, and chose three of their brethren, viz. Mr. Prindle, Mr. Brimsmaid and Mr. Groves, to ordain him. On the day appointed, they came from their labor with their leather-aprons and leather mittens on, which was a common dress at that time, and assembled in a log barn at the south end of the point of land which had been cultivated. Each of the three made a prayer over Mr. Chauncy, put their hands upon his head and told him to take authority to be a minister in the vineyard of Jesus Christ. Mr. Brimsmaid put on his hand first, with his leather mitten on, and the other two followed his example, hence the Congregational Presbyterian ordination in Connecticut has been termed the "Leather Mitten Ordination," and it is a fact that most of the Presbyterian ordinations in Connecticut have been derived from the common people. Mr. Buckingham was ordained by the brethren of his church, in Saybrook, in presence of the Council of Ministers, (as they called themselves,) and his ordination was acknowledged and received by them as valid—Mr. Prudden, of Milford, and others, were ordained in the same way, and their ordinations were acknowledged and they ordained others. (*See Trumbull's History of Connecticut, vol.* 1, *pages* 286, 264, &c, *edition of* 1818.)

to believe ; or it must be derived from God, from him who had all power in Heaven and on Earth, by a direct, uninterrupted line of SUCCESSION. No one can lawfully act by authority of the State of Connecticut, or of the United States, without authority from them, and this can be derived only two ways, viz. immediately from the people, and then it requires immediate evidence from them to prove it ; or it must be derived by a succession from the regularly constituted authority. Because a man or a body of men have the statute law of the State, they have not power to make a Justice of the Peace : and because a man or body of men have the Bible, they have not power to make a priest. It requires as much authority to make a justice as it does to make a law ; and it requires as much authority to make a minister of God as it does to make a Bible. The civil and ecclesiastical authorities are derived from different sources, and ought to be kept perfectly separate and distinct ; and a union of these two authorities has caused more distress, devastation, and blood-shed, than all the wars. than all the plagues or famines, with which the earth has ever been visited. I am also in the opinion, that the separation of our forefathers, not from the civil, but from the ecclesiastical authority of England, and the church of England, was at first very unnecessary and unreasonable, and that it is now the imperative duty of all, to return to the Episcopal church. It is dishonorable to God and dangerous to the souls of men. to depart from the authority, the doctrine, and the worship of the universal church. This is the general assembly and church of the first born here on earth, and it is preparatory to the church which is triumphant in Heaven. In this Episcopal church they all speak the same things at the same time. In this church all nations, countries and languages, make the same humble confession of their sins before God in the same words and at the same time; they all hear God's merciful forgiveness pronounced upon all who do truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy gospel ; with one mouth and in the same words they set forth God's most worthy praise ; they all have the same portions of scripture and receive the same instructions at the same time. In this church there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one

God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all. With this ancient and universal church I have thought it my duty to unite, and to persuade others to do the same.

In regard to experimental religion, I think it essential that the natural disposition of the human heart should be changed from ungodliness and worldly lusts, to the love and practice of a sober, righteous and godly life and conversation ; but in this case, as in all others, I think that no man or woman ever acts wisely, except when they act reasonably. In short, I have opposed enthusiasm, bigotry, and superstition, on one side ; and I have opposed infidelity, immorality, and licentiousness, on the other. And these, Sir, are my crimes :— these principles and this practice have raised upon me a host of enemies, and have brought me to this jail, this place of disgraceful punishment : and were the truth of it avowed, for it I could willingly burn at the stake, I could suffer any punishment, here or in Newgate, or in any other place, and never should relinquish till my soul should cease to exist. But to suffer as I do, under the false and feigned charge of crimes which never entered my heart, and which, for their foulness, would blacken hell, is the sorest, the heaviest, and the most grievous affliction, that could be laid upon me. Sir, I am a persecuted man. I am not guilty of what is laid to my charge, neither did it ever come into my mind. I am wholly ignorant and innocent of these or of any other crimes or misconduct with Asenath C. Smith, *and I have no idea that my persecutors ever thought I was guilty.* It is hard to suffer in this way and for these things, when I am not guilty, merely because I have proposed that Bishop Jarvis and the Episcopal clergy of Connecticut should unite with the republicans, vote for Ephraim Kirby, Esq. to be governor, and use their honest endeavours to do away that religious establishment in the state, by which all must pay taxes to support a religion which they did not believe, which they thought was of human invention ; or go and acknowledge themselves *dissenters*, and humbly pray them to take a certificate ; merely because I have opposed the federal Presbyterian estatablishment of the state, and because I would not submit to papers issued and published againt me by Bishop Jarvis without the previous

steps required by his ordination vows, and by the authority of that church to which we belonged.

That the governor should feel it necessary to put a construction on the constitution of Connecticut wholly different from what I had apprehended, to me, is a source of disappointment and sorrow. That instrument was, in my view, a supreme law of the state, contrary to which any other law, if made, would cease to be a law: it would *ipso facto*, be null and void in itself. By that instrument the governor has power to reprieve after conviction *in all cases*, except those of impeachment, *but here is a case which is not by impeachment*, ergo, the governor has no power to reprive in any other than capital cases. This is a kind of logic which was not taught in Yale College when I had the honor of being a member of that institution.

If I may not be permitted to collect my witnesses and to prove the facts and representations contained and set forth in my petition, nor to disprove any thing which may be said against it, an investigation would be unequal, unfair and dangerous, as the character of falsehood might be fixed upon that which was strictly true. Though I have the fullest confidence in your Excellency, in the General Assembly, and in the state, yet it must be evident *that the honor of the state* is deeply concerned to diminish the credibility of what I claim in this case, of what I know, and of what, by permission of the governor, I could prove to be true; without that permission I should doubt the expediency of laying it before the General Assembly in its present form; it may be epitomized, and their attention confined to a few obvious facts, merely because I may not be permitted to prove or disprove any thing; but this would be doing great injustice to myself; nor did I expect the governor to investigate the truth or falsity of the facts connected with my case, any farther forth than they appeared in the petition itself; and for this obvious reason, that I could not be present to advocate or defend. There were only two witnesses in my trial who claimed to have any knowledge of any improper conduct of Asenath C. Smith and me. One was a poor, mean, lying thievish negro boy, whose master declared that he could not believe him when

he was sent on a common errand ; that he placed no confidence in his story, that he had reprimanded him for it, and who only the summer before was actually arrested for stealing. The other was Maria A. Smith, the supposed sister of the said Asenath, who on trial before the court, made oath that she had told so many different stories, and contradicted herself so often on the subject, that she did not think her testimony would be received ; who also acknowledged under oath before the court, that she had frequently and seriously confessed to different persons and in different places, that she had taken a false oath against me, before the justice when I was bound over, and who is now, this very moment, if report be *true*, supporting herself at the expense of her chastity in a common bawdy house in the city of New-York. To refer the Governor, or the General Assembly, or any person in the world to such witnesses for the truth or falsity of any thing, I should be absolutely ashamed, and would not do it, had not Mr. Lanman called them into notice, and improved them for the purpose of destroying an Episcopal clergyman, and a republican, by fixing crimes upon me which never came into my mind, and of which I am absolutely as innocent as the ministers of the upper sanctuary. Devoutly uniting in the hope expressed by your Excellency that truth and justice may prevail, I am very respectfully your Excellency's most obedient and very humble servant.

AMMI ROGERS.

To the Hon. General Assembly of Connecticut. May, 1822.

I, Asenath C. Smith, of Griswold, in the county of New-London, of lawful age, depose and say, [*the same as in page* 88] And I further depose and say, that Ammi Rogers never had carnal knowledge of me, and never attempted such a thing ; that he never used with me any drug or medicine, or instrument, or any means whatever to produce in me an abortion, and that I do not know that he knew that I was like to have a child, until long after I was delivered. But by the advice and persuasion of certain persons [Lanman, Halsey and Downer] in the year 1819, I went forward and unjustly charged that upon Mr. Rogers, which I had before justly and truly charged upon another person, and went further, and accused

him of that which never existed, for which he is now suffering imprisonment. I now depose and say expressly that the drug or medicine, and instrument described in the indictment against Mr. Rogers, were presented and explained to me by a physician [Doct. Downer] and not by Mr. Rogers; and that I do not know that they were ever in his possession, and that he is wholly innocent of these, or of any other crimes or misconduct with me; and that I never should have accused him, had it not been for others, &c. and further this deponent saith not. ASENATH C. SMITH.

New-London county, ss.—Norwich, March 26, 1822.

Personally appeared the above named Asenath C. Smith, and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition according to law, before me, JOHN HYDE, *Just. Peace.*

Died in the city of New-York, on the 19th of April, 1826, the Rev. SAMUEL PETERS, L. L. D. a clergyman of the Episcopal church, aged 99 years, 4 months and 7 days, (I did suppose he had been older.) Not long before his death he composed and wrote with his own hand, the following letter, viz.

To the Rev. Ammi Rogers, Hebron, Connecticut.

Rev. and dear Sir,

Many days have passed since I have received a letter from you; but I have heard with extreme sorrow of your calamity, and now rejoice at the news of your deliverance out of the power of bitter enemies and oppressors.

The persecution, at New-London, by a judge and jury, ought not to make you despond; but induce you to follow the example of the Rev. George Burrows, A. M. the minister of Salem, in Massachusetts, eminent for his talents, learning and piety: and rendered immortal by his sufferings, faith and patience in 1692, *by the Witch Plague of New-England.*—[*He was executed in Salem, Massachusetts, for being a wizard.*] He prayed for his persecutors, lived on his innocence, and died in faith of Jesus, and left vengeance, justice and equity to GOD, who always does well. Judge Danforth and his jury condemned a man to death, without any witnesses, except envy, prejudice, and crazy men and women. No one can stand before envy—as we see verified in the trial of Jesus, St. Stephen, John Rogers, John Wesly, George Whit-

field, Hugh Peters, and myriads of other innocents. Envy, zeal and prejudice are generated by self interest, fancy and opinion. I have not seen your printed trial, but suppose it resembles Dr. Mather's history of Deacon Potter's trial at New-Haven, for bestiality ; proved by the opinion of his young wife and son—when his real crime was lodging Quakers. [James Lanman caused to be published, though he nor the reputed author dare put their names to it, the most false, abusive, and malicious representation of a pretended trial of me, that ever was published against any man in the United States, since the blue laws of Connecticut, and proved to be such before a court of law in Tolland county, on the first day of October, 1823.] But I have been informed that Miss Smith first made oath against the Rev. Ammi Rogers *of such and such crimes*, before a justice of the peace : whether her oath was true or false, the justice was holden by law to bind the defendant to a trial before the superior court. This was done. Then Miss Smith went to another justice of the peace, and made solemn oath before him, that the oath which she had made against the Rev. Ammi Rogers *of such and such crimes*, was not true, but perfectly false. It matters not in law and in common sense, which of the two oaths is true or false, because the last oath destroyed the first ;—and as she stands on record guilty of perjury, the indictment dies of course, and the county attorney is by law obliged to enter his *nolle prosequi*. If Miss Smith by a third oath should recant, and swear that her second oath is false, and that her first oath is true ; it cannot cancel the perjury, as a perjured person on record, cannot by law or reason be a witness in any court.—A judge that dare admit a perjured person to be a witness against a criminal, acts directly against the law of God and man, and makes himself guilty of perjury and murder. I see not then how the judge and jury could find the Rev. Ammi Rogers guilty *of such and such crimes*, as charged against him by Miss Smith, whose testimony is lighter than vanity, or the shadow of a shade, unless fancy, envy, and zeal, contrary to knowledge, were deemed valid by the help of perjury. I trust that patience, faith and hope will support you in all evils that have or may fall on you in time, and will bear

you up on the grace of love, to the realms above, where faith and hope are known no more, and there with saints for ever love.

I am informed that you gained the prejudice of the Rev. Dr. Beach, in the city of New-York, and other clergymen, by out living and out preaching them, which first begun your persecution. This character you might easily have gained by your talents, learning, piety, charity, oratory, and polite manners ;—perhaps the same clerical virtues have reached Connecticut, and caused the dragon to cast water out of his mouth as a flood after the woman in the wilderness.

My son, my only son, [*Mr. Birdseye Peters.*] is dead—at Mobile June 4, 1822 : he was born at Hebron June 4, 1774, (48 years old ;)—let those mourn who part to meet no more ! *Sapientissimus Frater, Patres et filii mortui sunt, ut veruntamen est resurrectionem*—[i. e. my wisest brother, our fathers and our children are dead, but there will soon be a resurrection.] I shall be glad to hear from you and to see you. I shall soon go out of darkness to live in light, in life, and in love—*veni vide totam meam gloriam in resurrectionem*,—[i. e. come and behold all my glory in the resurrection. I am yours,

SAMUEL PETERS.

Maria A. Smith, and all the family, first declared to James Cook, Esq. to Messrs. Rose, Baker, Fry, and others, that I never had courted or kept private company with the said Asenath, and that the charges against me were false, (see page 96)—she then cleared me of every impropriety of conduct at their house, or within her knowledge or belief, by a certificate in her own hand writing, (see page 87.)—She then went before Farwel Coit, Esq. and made oath that I had courted the said Asenath ; that she had seen us in bed together ; that I was shut up alone with her in their chamber, with fastened doors, and no one admitted, from Tuesday to Saturday, &c. She then confessed to me, in presence of Lester Clark, that she knew, and I knew, and God knew, that it was all a lie which she had testified ; she made the same confession to Mr. Enoch Baker, (see page 130)—she then wrote to Lanman, and contradicted the false testimony which she

said he had induced her to give before Esq. Coit. She then went before Denison Palmer, Esq. and made solemn oath that she could not in conscience say it again, and that she had no reason to think that the charges were true, (see page 109.) She then confessed to Miss Willoughby, that she had taken a false oath against me before Esq. Coit, and that old Halsey, Doct. Downer, and James Lanman, had overpersuaded and hired her to do it, &c. (see page 133.) She then offered Mr. Willoughby, to come before the superior court, in person, and testify to it, (see page 132.) She then declared to Mr. Haughton, that I never had courted her sister, that she never had seen us in bed together. (see page 134.)—She then went before William Foster, Esq. and made solemn oath, that she could not in conscience testify again as she had done before Esq. Coit; that she had no reason to believe that the charges against me were true, &c. (see page 111.)

Mr. Lewis Collins, who keeps a very respectable tavern in Chester village, Mass. made solemn oath before William Wade, Esq a justice of the peace, December 4th, 1822, that he heard Maria A. Smith, on being reproached by me for lying and false swearing, say, Well, I don't care, I know I have lied, and lied under oath, and my oath is good for nothing, and I am glad of it, &c.

Mr. Samuel Thayer made oath, before the same justice, and on the same day, that he heard said Maria say to me, in presence of Mr. Gilman, at the house of a Mr Williams, Well, I have lied, and I will lie, and I have lied under oath before the court, and I will again if I have a mind to, and you cannot help yourself. At this time Mr. Lanman had given her great promises and assurances that if she would return and swear again before the court as she did before Coit, when I was bound over, she should be protected, and it never should hurt her, &c. She did return, and though a perjured person, though she then testified before the court, *that she had told so many different stories, and had contradicted herself so often on the subject, that she did not think that her testimony would be received—that she had confessed that she had taken a false oath against me*—yet the judge admitted her testimony; on it I was declared guilty, of what God knows never came into

my mind, and on it I have suffered the losss of character, liberty, honor, friends, property, of all worldly comforts. Is it not a hard case? Who would not complain? Would the judge have admitted her testimony if he had not been my enemy; if he had not been prejudiced; if I had not been condemned in his mind before I was heard? Since the trial the said Maria has, in words and in writing, contradicted the testimony which she then gave, and on which I was most cruelly and unjustly declared guilty. O Connecticticut! what hast thou not done! Publish it not in Gath; tell it not in the streets of Askelon! On the 8th day of October, 1822, *I was released from jail in due course of law*, after a note of more than $630 was extorted from me on peril of life and liberty; a great part of this money had been taken from the public treasury by Lanman and Halsey, under the false and feigned pretence of paying witnesses in this prosecution, and a great part of which money they have embezzled and squandered without ever paying it over to the witnesses. I speak and write without fear of contradiction. I do assert that James Lanman, Esq. as attorney for the state of Connecticut, in the county of New-London, has from time to time, and at different times, taken large sums of money from the public treasury to pay witnesses in public prosecutions, and has not paid it to them. In this prosecution against me, among many others, I mention Mrs. Eunice Howard, Samuel Dorrence, Socrates Balcomb, Capt. Ephraim Williams, Lydia Williams, &c.—and in other cases, Joel Loomis, Esq. $15. Capt. Clark, $10, &c. &c. There are witnesses now residing in the county of Saratoga, who knew nothing of the case, who were dragged from home, at great trouble and expence in going to court, staying and returning—money was taken from the treasury to pay them, but they have never been able to obtain it. Is this fair? is this honorable? is it just? Would the attorney-general of the state of New-York conduct in this manner? Indeed, the whole prosecution, and its consequences have been unjust, cruel, tyrannical, and abusive in the highest degree. In civil society we relinquish our natural rights to have our civil and moral rights secured. How far my civil and moral rights have been secured in the state of Connecticut, those who have or

will read the foregoing trial, (if it can be called a trial, for there was no attempt made to prove the crimes as charged in the information,) must and will judge.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT,

Convened in Hartford in May 1823, *on the Memorial of Ammi Rogers appointed a joint committee of both Houses to take his case into consideration, to grant him a hearing and to report thereon.* The said committee assigned the 27th and 28th days of May 1823, for the aforesaid consideration hearing and investigation in the *Senate Chamber*, and notice was given accordingly.

Hartford, Senate Chamber, May 27th, 1823.

Present, The Hon. David Hill, of the Senate, *Chairman*,
Abner Reed, Esq. } *Committee.*
John Stanton, Esq. }

I, Ammi Rogers appeared and said, *Gentlemen*, I do not come before you in the strength and power of Goliah of Gath, defying the armies of the living God? but I come before you as a meek, humble and persecuted christian, and minister of our common Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I have been falsely accused, partially and unfairly tried, and unjustly condemned and imprisoned for crimes committed with Asenath C. Smith, in Griswold, in the county of New-London. Of these crimes I am absolutely as innocent as either of you gentlemen of the committee, as any member of the General Assembly, or as as any minister of the Heavenly Sanctuary. May I beseech you to grant me a patient and candid hearing, and to make that report which you can justify before God, the bar of your own consciences, and the bar of all intelligent creation. I beg permission to read in the first place my petition on which you have been appointed by both Houses of the Honorable General Assembly to act, which is in the following words and figures, viz.

To the Hon. General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, convened in the city of Hartford, on the first Wednesday of May, 1823.

Ammi Rogers of Hebron, in the county of Tolland, comes, complaint makes, and says, that in Norwich, in the county of New-London, on the 29th day of April, 1819, he was, by Farwel Coit, Esq. justice of the peace, in and for said county, bound over to the honorable Superior Court for trial. on the false and feigned charges, brought by James Lanman, Esq. attorney for the said county, that he, your complainant, had, in the town of Griswold, in said county, on the first day of July, 1817, &c. and that he had,&c. in said Griswold, on or about the first day of Nov. in that same year. The complainant says,that in open court of inquiry before said Coit, on the aforesaid 29th day of April, he delivered to the said Coit and Lanman, as evidence in the case. many important documents and papers, among which was the deposition of Curtis Hickox, Esq. in which he made solemn oath that your complainant was at his house in Washington, in Litchfield county. about 100 miles from Griswold, and from the said Asenath, on that very first day of July, 1817. and that he the said Hickox did then and there pay him forty dollars in money, and took his receipt in full, dated at that time and place, which receipt he inclosed to the said court in his said deposition. Also the complainant says, that he delivered as evidence in the case, on the aforesaid 29th day of April, to the said Coit and Lanman, the depositions of Doct. Wells Beardslee and Homer Swift, Esq. in which they made solemn oath, that your complainant was with them in Kent, not far from the aforesaid Washington, on and long before the said first day of July, 1817, and not in Griwold, as was falsely charged by the said Lanman. And your complainant says that in the year 1817, he did not see the said Asenath. from about the 10th of May until about the 15th of September, and that he never did, at any time of his life, have any criminal connexion with her; and that he was not informed and did not know that the said Asenath was or had been like to have a child until many months after she was delivered. And your complainant says, that it was not till 1819, and that by the vilest ars and most

wicked means, she was overpersuaded to charge that child falsely upon him, which in 1817, she had been like to have by a certain young physician, whose private company she had constantly kept for about two or three years then last past, who was with her and staid all night, and actually lay with her, on or about the night of that very first day of July, 1817, which child, in her deposition, dated May 28th, 1818, she had justly and truly charged upon him, and which she had lost by sickness, by infirmity, or by accident. Your complainant says, that on trial before the honorable Superior Court in New-London, 1820, he demanded of the said Coit, who was then present, the papers and documents which were delivered to him as evidence at the binding over; that he refused to give them up without special order of the court; that the court then directed them to be given up; that the said Coit then declared that he had not got them, and called upon the said Lanman for them; that the said Lanman, after looking over some papers, said he did not take them; and the court, in almost an unheard of manner, directed them to proceed in the trial, while the accused was thus cheated and cajoled out of the undeniable evidence of his innocence. [*The reader is requested to turn to page* 99. *and see the documents which were delivered to the justice at the binding over, and now on trial unjustly, cruelly and wickedly withheld and concealed; and say if the trial could be fair without them.*] Some of which have been returned to him since the trial, when they could be of no use, but by far the greatest and most important part are withheld and concealed from him. Your complainant says, that in this way, and among many other extraordinary and unprecedented privations, he has been partially and unfairly tried, unjustly condemned and imprisoned, and wickedly and cruelly deprived of almost every thing which could make life desirable: and a promissory note of more than 600 dollars, to pay the costs has been extorted from him while in duresse as the only condition of his liberty, and perhaps of his life. All which wrong doings your complainant says, that by permission of your honorable General Assembly he can abundantly prove, and he now and hereby offers to do it, by having time to collect his testimony; and now prays the honorable General

Assembly to take his case into consideration, to grant him a hearing in the premises by himself and counsel, to cause the said note to be given up, and to grant such other relief as their wisdom and goodness may suggest, and he as in duty bound will ever pray. Dated Hartford, May 13th, 1823.

AMMI ROGERS.

The above and foregoing is a true copy of the original petition on file. Examined by me.

THOMAS DAY, *Secretary.*

Gentlemen of the Committee—I beg permission now to read the information on which I have been partially and unfairly tried, and unjustly condemned and imprisoned.

To the Hon. Superior Court, &c. in and for New-London Co.

James Lanman, Esq. attorney for said state, within and for said county. *Information* gives, that in the town of Griswold in said county, on the first day of July A. D. 1817, Ammi Rogers, of the town aforesaid, *a transient preacher*, &c. pretendedly of the *Christian religion*, did, &c. assault make on the body of Asenath Caroline Smith, of said Griwold, a sole, single, unmarried young female, &c. and did then and there—[i. e. in Griswold, on the first day of July, 1817,] unlawfully beget her with a bastard child, &c. and the said attorney further gives *information*, that the said Rogers did, on or about the first day of November, in the year aforesaid, in the said town of Griswold, &c. by the use of drugs and an unusual instrument, produce in her, the said Asenath, an abortion of the said child, &c. &c. all which wrong doings of the said Rogers are against the peace of the state, and the laws of the same, &c. and a high crime and misdemeanor, and to the evil example of others in like cases to offend. Dated at Norwich, September 28th, A. D. 1820.

JAMES LANMAN, *Attorney.*

Gentlemen.—Of these crimes I am certainly wholly innocent. In the first place I beg permission to introduce the testimony of Mr. Thomas Wells: he is a man of the first reputation, one of the wardens of the church in Hebron, a selectman of the town, and for many years a member of the General Assembly—he testified that he has been for between twenty-five and thirty years last past, well acquainted with

me and my character; that he considers my character to be, and to have been, good; and that I was then the settled minister of the Episcopal church in that place, and had been so for five or six years, then last past. (*See page* 100.)

Mr. Hiram Haughton testified, that I was then, and for five or six years, then last past, had been the settled minister of the Episcopal church in that place; that for the time last mentioned, I had made his house my home, and had boarded in his family, when I was in town; that he considered my conduct as a minister and as a man, publicly and privately, to be good, [see page 101.] May it please the committee: It is now proved by the wardens of the church where I lived, that I was not *a transient preacher*, as is alleged in the information, but was then, and for five or six years then last past, had been a settled minister in Hebron. Mr. Lanman says *pretendedly of the Christian religion*. This, gentlemen, is the very knob of the whole. The whole Episcopal church, in all nations, ages and countries, is only the *pretended* Christian religion. James Lanman, Esq. attorney for the state of Connecticut, in New-London county, has said it in this information, and a jury of twelve men have said under oath that it was true; but it is certain that when our forefathers first came to this country, they came from England, and when they came from England, they came from the church of England; and if the church of England is nothing, and they came from nothing, they must be nothing. It is a maxim in common arithmetic, that nought from nought, and there remains nought.—It is a maxim in Latin, that *ex nihilo nihil fit*, i. e. from nothing, nothing can come. I have only one thing more to observe in reply to this charge: that if the Episcopal church be only the *pretended* Christian religion, as Mr. Lanman alleges in the information, then the Bible, and Christianity itself, is a sham, for the world are beholden to the Episcopal church, under God, for these.

The next thing charged upon me in the *information* is, that in the town of Griswold, ON THE FIRST DAY OF JULY, 1817—I did unlawfully commit a crime with Asenath C. Smith, a sole, single and unmarried young female. In reply I beg permission to read the following depositions, viz.

To the Honorable General Assembly of Conn.—May, 1823.

I, Curtis Hickox, of Washington, in Litchfield county, of lawful age, depose and say, that Ammi Rogers was at my house, in Litchfield county, [100 *miles from Griswold.*] on the first day of July, 1817; and that I then and there paid him $40 in money, and then took his receipt in full of all demands: which facts I afterwards stated in my deposition, which I made before proper authority, and gave to the said Rogers, to be improved in a case which he said was pending against him in behalf of the state; and which deposition I now say was true, and that the inclosed, viz. (Washington, July 1st. 1817—this day settled all accounts and matters of every name and nature, with Curtis Hickox, and received forty dollars, to my full satisfaction. AMMI ROGERS.) is a true copy of the receipt which he gave me at my house, [100 miles from Griswold,] on the said first day of July, 1817, and further this deponent saith not.

CURTISS HICKOX.

Litchfield County. ss. Washington. May 24, 1823.

Personally appeared the above named Curtiss Hickox, Esq. who subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition in due form of law, before me,

YOUNGS ELLIOT Justice of the Peace.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY, May, 1823. Opened by me,

THOMAS DAY, Secretary.

By the Chairman.—Was you charged in the information with committing that crime in Griswold, on that PARTICULAR FIRST DAY OF JULY, 1817, or was it on or about that day?—ANS. It was on that particular day and no other. I then laid before the committee, in the hand writing of Mr. Lanman, the information which he had given and made against me; also, the information in a book which he had caused to be printed; and in both the crime was alleged to have been committed in Griswold on that particular first day of July, 1817, when I was not within about one hundred miles of the place or person, and had not been there that summer.

May it please the Committee.—I beg permission now to read the deposition of Doct. Wells Beardslee.

To the Hon. General Assembly of Connecticut, in May, 1823.

I, Wells Beardslee, of Kent, in Litchfield county, of law-

ful age, depose and say, that in the month of April, 1819, as appears from written memoranda which I have seen, I went before a justice of the peace, and gave my deposition to be improved before Farwel Coit, Esq. of New London county, in a case of the state against Ammi Rogers; that from the records of the Episcopal church in this place, and from other papers and writings, and from my own recollection, I was very confident that the said Ammi Rogers was, on the 1st day of July, 1817, and for some time before, in Kent, [not far from Washington,] and that he was not in Griswold; and that what I then testified is true: and I further depose and say, that Homer Swift, Esq. late of said Kent, deceased, gave at the same time and before the same authority, a deposition to the same amount; and that the said depositions were delivered to the said Rogers, to be conveyed to the said court, and further this deponent saith not. WELLS BEARDSLEE.

Litchfield county, ss.—Kent, May 25th, 1823.

Personally appeared the above named Doct. Wells Beardslee, who subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition in due form of law, before me,

JOHN H. SWIFT, Justice of the Peace

May it please the Committee—The depositions of Curtiss Hickox, Esq. Dr. Beardslee, and Homer Swift, Esq. prove beyond all contradiction that I was one hundred miles from Griswold *on the first day of July*, 1817, and for some time before, and that I was not, and for a long time had not been, within 100 miles of Griswold, where and when the crimes now charged upon me were said to have been committed, and this evidence was then in the hands of the civil authority of Connecticut; but because I was an Episcopal clergyman, and unfriendly to the religious establishment of the state, it was wickedly withheld and concealed, and the court knowing this, proceeded in the trial without it. Will you, gentlemen, say that this was fair? was it just, was it honest? By Mr. Reed. —What proof have you of this? Ans. I have abundance, and now request permission to read the deposition of Capt. Townsend.

To the Hon. General Assembly of Connecticut, May, 1823.

Capt. John Townsend, of Hebron, in the county of Tol-

land, of lawful age, deposeth and saith, 1st. That he was present at the trial of Ammi Rogers before the Superior Court in New-London, 1820. 2d. That Elisha Geer was the first witness who testified in the trial. 3d. That he recollects that the said Rogers called upon Esquire Coit for the papers that were delivered to him at the binding over; [*see page* 99,] that he denied having them, and referred to Esq. Lanman, who said he did not take them, and *the court proceeded in the trial without them;* that he stood very near the said Rogers, on the said trial, when the said papers were called for; that there were among others, depositions from gentlemen in Washington and in Kent, and the certificate of Elisha Geer and family. &c. 4th. He remembers that after the pleadings were closed, the said Rogers requested permission to bring in a witness whom he understood to be Asenath C. Smith, and observed that she alone could be supposed to know whether the facts charged against him were true or not; that she was not permitted to testify, on the ground that she was not offered sooner. 5th. That in October last he went to Norwich after the said Rogers, when the time of his imprisonment had expired; that the State's Attorney came into the prison and presented him a note to sign; as the condition of his liberty; that he remonstrated in warm terms, and refused to sign it, except in duresse; that the Attorney went off in apparent anger, and said he might lie in Jail; that by the interference of himself and Esq. Stewart, the said Rogers consented to sign it as he wished, but at the same time, said it was perfectly unjust, and that he would do it only to obtain his liberty and to save his life; the said Attorney was then requested by this deponent and said Stewart to return, which he did towards evening, when the said Rogers signed the note, in prison.

JOHN TOWNSEND.

County of Tolland, ss. Coventry, May 26, 1823.

Personally appeared the above named Capt. John Townsend, who subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition, in due form of law, before me,

ISAIAH DAGGETT, *Justice of Peace.*

General Assembly, May, 1823, *opened by me,*

Thomas Day, Secretary.

Question, by the Chairman.—What is the character of this witness. Ans. I am not trifling, nor shall I ever *knowingly* impose upon any one by false or discreditable witnesses. I see in this chamber some gentlemen of worth and distinction from the town of Hebron, who are acquainted with Captain Townsend—here is Ralph Gilbert, Esq. a respectable attorney at law, in that place, I wish he would testify what he knows relative to the character of this witness.

Ralph Gilbert, Esq. I had no expectation of being called upon to testify at this time. Captain Townsend now is, and for sometime past has been, one of the Selectmen of Hebron; he is a man of good moral character, much respected in the town, and whose truth and veracity I have never heard impeached; and I believe him to be as much to be depended upon as any other man.

To the Hon. General Assembly of Connecticut, in May, 1823.

I, *James Cook*, of Preston, in New London county, of lawful age, depose and say, that I was present at the court of inquiry before Farwel Coit, Esq. on the *Information* of J. Lanman against Ammi Rogers, &c. that I distinctly recollect that the said Rogers delivered to said Coit a number of papers and documents, as evidence in the case, [here he states what papers they were (*see page* 99;] that on trial, before the Superior Court in New-London, 1820, I heard the said Rogers call upon the said Coit for the papers which were delivered to him, as evidence at the binding over; that said Coit refused to give them up without the order of the court; that the court then directed them to be given up; that said Coit then declared that *he had not got them*, and called upon Lanman for them; that Lanman, upon looking over several papers, declared that *he did not take them*, and the court directed them to proceed in the trial without them. [Will this committee, will the General Assembly, will any person in the whole world say that this was a fair trial? Here was evidence, to prove beyond all contradiction, that I was not within about one hundred miles of the person or place, when the crime was sworn to have been committed by me; the ev-

idence was then in the hands of Lanman, as a public minister of justice; he withheld and concealed it! the court proceeded without it; I was declared guilty, and imprisoned, and myself and family disgraced and ruined! O, how cruel, how unjust, how wicked! Might not the most innocent man or woman on earth, be condemned, imprisoned, and ruined in this way? Who could have thought it of Connecticut! But the spirit of the old blue laws is not yet entirely extinguished.] I further depose and say, that in my opinion the characters of Maria A. Smith, now Maria A. Packer, and Sam, the negro, who were the principal witnesses against Mr. Rogers, were not equal to that of people in general, in point of truth and veracity; and further the deponent saith not.

JAMES COOK.

New-London County, ss. Preston, May 19, 1823.

Personally appeared the above named James Cook, Esq. who subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition, before me,

DENISON PALMER, *Justice of Peace.*

General Assembly, May, 1823, *opened by me,*

Thomas Day, Secretary.

Mr. Peleg Rose made solemn oath, that he saw me deliver to said Lanman and Coit, at the binding over, a number of papers and documents, as evidence in the case, [*see page* 99.] and particularly the depositions from the gentlemen in Washington and Kent; and that the characters of Maria and Sam, who were the principal witnesses against me, were very bad, and not equal to people in general as to truth and veracity.

May it please the Committee—I wish now to introduce the testimony of Mr. Perry Clark, who is the uncle of the said Asenath, having married her mother's sister, lived in the same house with them, and brought her up at his own table. He is a man of good property—worth eight or ten thousand dollars—of good moral character, and whose truth and veracity has not, within my knowledge or belief, been impeached. On trial he and his wife were got out of the State, and their testimony could not be obtained.

To the Hon. General Assembly of Connecticut, in May, 1823.

I, Perry Clark, of Griswold, &c. depose and say, that in

the year 1817, and long before and since. Asenath C. Smith and Maria A. Smith lived in the same house with me; that I do know, that in the forepart of the summer of 1817, and long before that time, a certain young physician was in the habit of coming to my house, and of being in private company with Asenath C. Smith; I well remember that not long before he went his journey to the westward, which I think was in the month of July, 1817. he came to my house and staid all night, and I personally know that he came out of the bed chamber of the said Asenath at that time, between break of day and sunrise. [This is the very time that I was charged with committing that crime with her, for which I have suffered two years imprisonment! when in truth I was not within about one hundred miles of her, had not seen her that whole summer; and this young physician was in the habit of being in her private company, was there and staid all night and actually came out of her bed chamber at that very time, between break of day and sunrise; what, I beseech you, could any man prove more than this? What *need* any man prove more than this? If either of you, gentlemen, were falsely accused as I am, how could you prove yourself innocent more than I have? and is it not hard to suffer unjustly as I have?] And I depose and say, that I have no knowledge that Ammi Rogers was at my house during the summer of 1817, but well remember that for several months he was not there, and I understood he had gone into the state of New-York, after his daughter, &c. that a certificate was signed by the said Asenath and all the family, clearing Mr. Rogers of every impropriety of conduct at my house, which I then believed, and now believe, to be true. [*see page* 87.] but in 1819 [two years after the supposed child.] Col. Halsey and Doct. Downer came to my house for the purpose of getting the said Asenath and Maria to testify against Mr. Rogers; that they staid all night and took her into a private bed room alone and the next morning the said Halsey dictated and the said Downer wrote the testimony which I heard the said girls give against the said Rogers when he was bound over. [Was there ever so vile, so wicked, so malicious a conspiracy formed against any man in this country before?] The crimes

charged upon Mr. Rogers were said to have been committed at my house in 1817, but I never did hear the said Asenath, nor any of the family, accuse Mr. Rogers in these things until 1819. [Is it not very strange if the charges were true?] I depose and say, that about that time, James Lanman, Esq. came to my house at about two or three o'clock in the afternoon, and took Asenath into my east chamber alone, and remained there until some time in the evening, when I called him; [he says about nine or ten o'clock at night;] that when he came out of the chamber he told me, that for Asenath to testify against Mr. Rogers, would be the best and most honorable thing that she could do; that it never should hurt her, nor cost her any thing; that she need not and should not be called upon to testify publicly in the case, &c. [Was not this conduct of Lanman very unfair, unjust, dishonorable and unbecoming the dignity of the public office of a State's Attorney?] And I testify, that the same assurances were given to the said Asenath, in my hearing, by the said Halsey and Downer, at the time they came to my house and staid all night; and I further testify, that in the summer and fall of 1817, I well remember, that the said Asenath was very sickly, weak, unwell, and had fits, and particularly on the week before she was said to be delivered, in one of her fits she fell from the bed on to the floor and caught me by the heel: and further the deponent saith not. PERRY CLARK.

New-London county, ss. May 20th, 1823.

Personally appeared the above named Perry Clark, who subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition, in due form of law, before me,

JEDEDIAH BARSTOW, Justice of Peace.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY, May, 1823, opened before me,

THOMAS DAY, Secretary.

Sophia Clark, wife of Perry Clark, and his son Lester Clark, made solemn oath and testified the same as is contained in the foregoing deposition.

ASENATH CAROLINE SMITH, the principal witness, was then called and sworn by the chairman, in the presence of a great concourse of people who had assembled in the senate chamber, in the city of Hartford, to hear this extraordinary case.

She was a young woman, then about twenty-six years of age, of a good figure, though rather small, very handsome, dressed well, appeared well, and had more learning than most young women of her circumstances. By the Chairman.—Miss Smith, you are now under the solemnity of an oath; you will please to testify what you know in this case. Answer. Mr. Rogers is not guilty of what is charged against him concerning me. He never did have any carnal knowledge of me, either before or since his trial, and never has offered to me any thing of the kind. Before this misfortune happened to me, I had for two or three years kept private company with a young physician; but I do not wish to implicate others: Mr. Rogers is innocent, and I never should have accused him, had it not been for Col. Halsey, Doct. Downer, and Esquire Lanman: THEY OVERPERSUADED AND HIRED ME TO SAY WHAT I DID AGAINST MR. ROGERS, WHEN HE WAS BOUND OVER, AND IT WAS NOT TRUE. By Mr. Stanton.—Did you not once swear that it was true? Ans. I suppose I did; but I now with sorrow and shame confess that it was not true, and I never should have said it, had it not been for them. By Mr. Stanton.—Does not your conscience reprove and upbraid you? Answer. Yes, Sir, my accusing Mr. Rogers wrongfully, as I did, has caused me more sorrow, tears and trouble than all that I have ever done besides; and my coming here of my own accord, (for I was not obliged to come) is an evidence of my sincerity. Here followed a lengthy examination by Mr. Reed, who was one of the committee, and a very strong Federal Presbyterian deacon: she testified that she was like to have a child, and lost it by being very weak, unwell and having fits, (if it was one, for she never saw it,) by Dr. George Downer; that his father, Col. Halsey and James Lanman, had overpersuaded and induced her, two years afterwards, to swear it falsely upon me. O, what unparalelled wickedness! what astonishing depravity, injustice and cruelty! How many heart felt sighs, tears and groans, have been brought from me, from my children and friends, and from every real disciple of the blessed Jesus, who himself was falsely accused, despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.

Here, Sir, said Asenath to the Chairman, is a letter, handing it to him, which I wrote to the church in Hebron; it will explain in some measure the motives and inducements which I had to accuse Mr. Rogers wrongfully. The letter was laid on the table.—Mr. Chairman, I wish now to lay before the committee the testimony of Dr. E.B. Downing, I consider him my personal, political and religious enemy.

To the Hon. General Assembly of Connecticut, May, 1823.

I, E. B. Downing, of Preston, &c. depose and say, 1st. That I delivered Asenath C. Smith of a dead fœtus in Griswold, on or about the 28th of October, 1817. 2d. That I did not discover any mark of violence upon it or its mother. 3d. That this premature birth might have been produced by sickness, infirmity or accident. 4th. That I never saw Ammi Rogers at the house of Elisha Geer in Griswold, except on the night when Mr. Perry Clark was taken sick and sent for me. 5th. That I do not know that said Rogers was in or about Griswold, immediately after the 24th of October, 1817. 6th. That I do not know that he had any agency in procuring the said premature birth, or that it was produced by violence. [What evidence, I ask the committee—I ask the judge and jury in the name of God; what evidence was there that violence had been used with her by any one to produce a premature birth?] 7th. That I do not know that the said Rogers was informed or did know, that the said Asenath was or had been like to have a child, until long after she had been delivered. 8th. That at the time of the said delivery I did not hear the said Asenath nor any of the family mention the name of the said Rogers: and further the deponent saith not.

ELEAZER B. DOWNING.

New London county, ss. Preston, May, 19, 1823.

Personally appeared Mr. Ebenezer B. Downing, signer of the foregoing deposition, and made solemn oath to the truth of the facts therein stated, in due form of law, before me,

DENISON PALMER, *Justice of Peace.*

To the Hon. General Assembly of Connecticut. May 1823.

I, Denison Palmer, of Preston, &c. depose and say, that in the month of September, 1819, Maria A. Smith, came before me and made solemn oath to the following facts, so far

as I can recollect, viz. 1st, That she had no reason to think that the charges against Ammi Rogers were true. 2d, That she never heard her sister accuse Mr. Rogers, until after Mr. Lanman, Col. Halsey, and Doct. Downer came there and overpersuaded her, and told her that it would be for her honor and her credit, and said they would pledge their lives that she never should be harmed if she would lay her child to Mr. Rogers. 3d, That they, some or all of them, went into a bed-room, and held a lengthy discourse with her sister Asenath. 4th, That when she came out she heard her say for the first time, [this was two years after,] that the said child was Mr. Rogers's and went on with other accusations against him, which she never heard of before. 5th, That the character of Sam, the negro, a principal witness in the trial of Mr. Rogers, was not then, and is not now, that of a man of truth and veracity. DENISON PALMER.

New-London county, ss. Preston. May 19, 1823

Personally appeared the above named Denison Palmer, Esq. who subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition, according to law, before me,

JAMES COOK, Justice of Peace.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY, May, 1823, opened by me,

THOMAS DAY, Secretary.

The committee adjourned till to-morrow, at 1 o'clock P. M.

HARTFORD, May 28, 1823.

The committee met according to adjournment.

I again appeared and said: Gentlemen, I beg permission to read a journal of the proceedings on yesterday—which I did; and then said—I come now to inquire more particularly into the conduct of Asenath, and wish to ask her some questions. She was called.—I said, Asenath, yesterday you solemnly testified under oath, before God and this Hon. Committee, that the charges against me, in the information concerning you, were false; that Col. Halsey, Doct Downer, and Esq. Lanman had overpersuaded and hired you to testify as you did against me, when I was bound over, that it was not true, and that you never should have said it, had it not been for them. Do you now swear that what you testified here yesterday was true? Ans. I do. Do you say, on your oath,

that the information against me concerning you, and for which I have been declared guilty and suffered imprisonment, is false? Ans. I do. Is my petition, which is now before this committee, and which you have heard read, so far as it relates to you, and so far as your knowledge extends, true or false? Ans. It is true. Here again she was carefully examined and cross-examined, and uniformly, plainly, intelligibly, and unequivocally asserted my innocence, and her own sorrow and shame for being induced to swear falsely and to accuse me wrongfully. I then called for the letter which she delivered to the committee yesterday, and read it in the following words, viz.

To the wardens and committee of the Episcopal church in Hebron.

OCTOBER 5th, 1819.

Gentlemen—With shame and confusion I presume to address you by the silent language of a pen; and it is humbly to confess my fault, and earnestly to ask your forgiveness. I think it is my duty to say that Mr. Rogers is certainly and absolutely innocent of what has been laid to his charge concerning me: and I certainly have been overpersuaded and induced by Col. Halsey, Dr. Downer and others to testify and say that against Mr. Rogers which was very unjust and wrong. I hereby confess it, and sincerely ask forgiveness. They assured me that Mr. Rogers was an important character, a cunning, artful man, *and one that the Bishop and Clergy were against.* [This shews that there was a plan, which was a secret, which was designed to carry into effect Jarvis's papers, to justify Bishop Hobart and to drive me off in less than one year, (*see page* 84] and if I would testify against him, it would be more for my honor, it should never hurt me, it should cost me nothing—I should be protected, that the whole town would pity me and be sorry for me; that all his enemies would be my friends, and that my character would be better than it ever was, for every body would take my part, would receive me into company, and treat me with respect, and that I should be respected by all my acquaintance. But if I did not do it; my father was dead, my mother was very like to die; I had no brother to take my part, I should be turned out of doors; that I should be hated and despised by

all my acquaintance and by every body ; that I should have nothing to eat and no where to stay.

Col. Halsey and Doct. Downer came to our house and staid all night. Doct. Downer took me into a bed room alone, and there talked to me, *he said as a friend*, and advised and overpersuaded me to lay my misfortunes, [not to his son] but to Mr. Rogers, and to accuse him, and then for the first time I consented to do it, which was in March or April, 1819—Col. Halsey told me what I should say, and Doctor Downer wrote it, and they overpersuaded me to agree to it, and to testify as I did against Mr. Rogers, and it was contrary to what I told them was true, and contrary to what they knew was right. Mr. Lanman came to our house and staid till nine or ten o'clock at night, &c. He took me into our east chamber alone, and though he said it would not do for him, in his office, to advise, yet he would say that it would be better for me, and more for my honor, if I would testify against Mr. Rogers ; he gave me his word and his honor, that it never should hurt me, nor cost me any thing, and that I should be protected ; and at length I confess that I was overpowered and overpersuaded to say and to do what I did ; for which I am now sincerely sorry ; and humbly ask forgiveness of God, of Mr. Rogers, and of you. If there is any excuse or palliation for me, or for my conduct, I pray you to consider it, &c. Iam, gentlemen, your much afflicted and very unworthy servant,

ASENATH C. SMITH.

By the Chairman. Do you swear that the foregoing letter is in your hand writing, and that it was composed by you ?—Ans. I do. By the same. Are the facts contained in that letter true ? Ans. They are. By the same. Was it written of your own accord and without the agency or assistance of any one ? Ans. It was, and I did it because I thought it my duty.

May it please the committee. I beg permission to read the deposition of Mr. Perry Clark, which was read yesterday. I read it in support of the testimony contained in the foregoing letter, (see page 185.) Mrs. Sophia and Mr. Lester Clark swore to the same facts—and is this the way that public justice is administered in the state of Connecticut ! Let them

no more boast of their superior virtue and integrity; of their religion and steady habits."

A BOOK,

Containing a false report of my trial.

Mr. Reed then read the testimony of Elisha Geer, as contained in a *printed book* purporting to be a report of my trial; and said that the testimony of Maria A. Smith was so correct and so circumstantial that it seemed as if it must be true. I replied—I deny that the witness ever did testify as is contained in that book, and let me ask, who says she did? Ans. The book. I ask who is the author of that book? who says it is true? Ans. I do not know—it is published. Yes, Sir, and a great many falsehoods are published, *and even sanctioned by courts of law*,—But to THIS BOOK I have seventeen objections, which I have here in writing, and which I now beg leave to read. 1st, THIS BOOK IS A BASTARD, it has no father;—there is no decent person who would not be ashamed to own it; no one has put his name to it, or pledged himself for its truth, and will this committee receive it as evidence? I say, 2d, it is a false report of the trial. By Mr. Hill.—You have no proof of that. Yes I have; there is proof now before this committee, that it is false; Capt. John Townsend and James Cook, Esq. have testified, and it is now before your honors, that Elisha Geer was the first witness on the trial, and that his testimony was objected to. The said book, in the 15th page represents Doct. Eleazer B. Downing as the first witness, which *misrepresentation* involves a very important law question, viz. *is collateral testimony admissible until the main facts charged be first proved?* so that here is now before this committee incontrovertible evidence that this book does, *in a very material point*, contain a false report of the said trial. I state my objections to THAT BOOK in the following words viz 1st. There is no name to it, and no one has pledged himself for the truth of it. 2d, It is not true, and it contains a false report of the trial. 3d, It represents me as degraded from the ministry, contrary to a solemn decision of our courts of law in Fairfield county, and contrary to a Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops in 1808. 4th, It contains an exaggerated representation of the proof against me when I was bound

over, and it wholly omits all the testimony adduced on my part. 5th, It omits an important decision of Judge Brainard in this case, viz. that it was contrary to the law of evidence to admit collateral testimony until the main facts charged were first proved. 6th. It omits the decision of Judge Chapman in this case, in admitting Elisha Geer to testify when he did not know, and it had not been proved, that any crime had been committed by any one. 7th. It represents the witnesses as testifying in an order in which they did not testify. 8th. It represents counsel as objecting to testimony when they did not object, and it neglects to report the objection when it was made. 9th, It represents almost every witness in the said trial, on both sides, as testifying that which they did not testify, and which if they had testified would have been false, and it omits what they did testify. 10th, It represents J. Brewster, Esq. and Doct. Downer, as being present and testifying to some important facts on the said trial, whereas J. Brewster, Esq. and Doct. Downer were not present in town at the trial, and never did at any time testify in the case. 11th, It neglects to report Mrs. Eunice Howard, Capt. Ephraim M. Williams, widow Lydia Williams, and others, who were present at the trial, and did testify wholly contrary to what the said book contains, and sets forth as true. 12th, It falsely represents me as applying to the Judge for the admission of a witness after he had arisen to charge the Jury, whereas it was before ; and it does not represent the transaction as it was, nor that Mr. Lanman had, only a few moments before, called in Maria A. Smith, and she was permitted to testify in explanation towards the close of the last plea. 13th, It contains a charge to the Jury which the Judge did not give, and it does not contain the charge which he did give. 14th, It does not contain the application which I made to the court for my papers and documents delivered in evidence to the justice at the binding over, without which I could not, and did not have a fair, impartial trial. 15th, It does not contain the application which I made to the judge, while I was on trial, for a witness whose testimony was necessary in my defence, and that the judge refused to send

for him. 16th, It does not represent me as deprived of the constitutional right of confronting the principal witness against me, by admitting collateral testimony before the main facts charged were proved. 17th, It does not contain the application which was then made for a new trial, on the ground that no crime charged in the information had been proved by any witness whatever, &c. May it please the committee—I have many other objections to *this scandalous book*, but what I have alleged must be sufficient to shew *what an astonishing imposition* has been palmed upon the public by it, and that it ought not to be received as evidence in any case, except to prove the falsehood and infamy of its author and patrons. I then introduced evidence to prove that the beforementioned seventeen objections were true; and the said book was ruled out as scandalously false and malicious; *and was not admitted as evidence.*

May it please the committee—I beg leave to introduce the testimony of one witness more, to prove what I have claimed in my memorial, and on which you are appointed to act; it is to prove that I was refused, while on trial, the privilege of a witness necessary in my defence. Was there ever such a thing heard of before in any Protestant country! Can any other state in the Union shew a clergyman, taken from 2000 people, where for six years then last past, a voice or a vote against him had not been known or heard of in his own parishes, except one man, (see page 101 ;)—dragged by false accusations before what should be a court of justice, and there refused the privilege of confronting the principal witness against him, on whose oath he was bound over for trial; his papers and documents, the undeniable evidence of his innocence, withheld and concealed; refused a necessary and important witness in his favor, when he was on trial and could not send for him, and a thievish, lying negro, and a perjured person, who confessed that she had taken a false oath against him; was admitted and received, and he was condemned upon it! where is there another case that can compare with this! Mr. Samuel Thayer made solemn oath, that he heard Maria A. Smith say, that she had lied, and would lie, and had lied before the court, and would again, if she was of a mind to, and I could not help myself.

Capt. Eph'm. M. Williams, of Groton, and others, heard her say since the trial in New-London, that in some things which she then testified, she was mistaken, and in other things she lied, *and a lie never had choked her, and did not choke her then;* yet this is the witness which Mr. Lanman could bring forward to destroy an Episcopal clergyman; a preacher, he says, "*pretendedly of the Christian religion.*" as though the Episcopal church was not *the Christian religion*, but only *pretendedly so*; General Washington was an Episcopalian, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, and Mr. Monroe, are Episcopalians, and most of the Christian world are Episcopalians; yet Mr. Lanman could say *pretendedly* of the Christian religion. It is true, I am not a Presbyterian, I never had the power of a *leather mitten upon my head*, and I never changed my politics in order to become a senator of the United States; and let others say what they may, I do not say that Mr. Lanman did.

To the Hon. General Assembly of Connecticut, May, 1823.

I, John C. Baker, of the town of Griswold, depose and say, that about the time I was going to the trial of Ammi Rogers in 1820, before the superior court in New-London, Lester Clark, of the town of Griswold, desired me to inform Mr. Rogers that he, the said Clark, knew that which would destroy the testimony of Maria A. Smith in said trial, and that if the said Rogers would send for him he would come and testify.—*And that the said Rogers applied to the court on the trial to send for said Clark, but the court declined*—[and he was not there] I further depose and say, that the character of Maria A. Smith, and that of Sam, the negro, in point of truth and veracity, are not equal to that of mankind in general; and further this deponent saith not. JOHN C. BAKER,

New-London county, ss —Griswold, May 16th, 1823.

Personally appeared Mr John C. Baker, signer to the above deposition, and made solemn oath to the truth of the same, before me,

JEDEDIAH BARSTOW, Justice of the Peace.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY, May, 1823. Opened by

THOMAS DAY, Secretary.

May it please the Committee—I have prayed the honor

able General Assembly of Connecticut, now convened, to grant me a rehearing on the information brought against me by James Lanman, Esq. and to give up a note of more than $630, which was extorted from me to pay the cost which had arisen on account of that information. My petition was founded on the ground that I was wholly innocent of the crimes charged upon me; 2d, that I had been partially and unfairly tried; 3d, that I was unjustly condemned and imprisoned, and wickedly and cruelly deprived of almost every thing which could make life desirable. On this memorial the honorable General Assembly have condescended to appoint a joint committee of both houses, which committee, gentlemen, you are, to investigate the grounds on which my memorial is predicated. I have by your goodness had an opportunity of exhibiting such proof as I thought *must be conclusive*. In the first place, I am wholly innocent of the crimes charged upon me in that information. I solemnly declare this. Asenath C. Smith herself has come before you in person, and has solemnly sworn that I was wholly innocent of these crimes charged upon me, relative to her; that I never had any carnal knowledge of her, either before or since the trial; that she never was like to have a child by me; that I never had produced in her an abortion, or used any means with her for that purpose; that she does not know that I knew, or had been informed that she was, or had been like to have a child until many months after she was delivered: Gentlemen, this is in proof now before you, and if it be true, will you say that I ought in justice to be imprisoned, and to pay that note? But she further testifies, that she was at that time, and long before, in the habit of keeping private company with a certain young doctor; that he came there and staid all night, on or about the first day of July, 1817; that she was then begotten with that child by him, which his father, Col. Halsey, and Esq. Lanman, in 1819, overpersuaded her to charge falsely upon me; which she lost by sickness, by infirmity, or by accident, but which they overpersuaded her to say falsely, was destroyed by ergot and an instrument procured and used with her by me.—That in the year 1817, she did not see me at home or abroad, from March or April, until some time in

September, and that I never did at any time in my life offer her any carnal or indecent connection ; gentlemen, this is in proof before you, and if it be true, ought I and my children and friends, and the public to suffer? But what, I beseech you, is there against this proof? does the witness herself confess that she was overpersuaded to make oath to the contrary ; and therefore she ought not to be believed? But Maria A. Smith confessed before the superior court that she had often acknowledged that she had taken a false oath against me, when I was bound over, and that old Halsey, Doct. Downer, and James Lanman had hired her to do it ; she made oath before Denison Palmer, Esq. and it is now in proof before this committee, that she had no reason to believe that the charges against me were true. At one time she said that she had taken a false oath against me, yet the superior court admitted her testimony to condemn me, why then will not this committee receive the testimony of Asenath C. Smith, who is ten thousand times more to be believed, to clear me? It is now in proof before this committee, *that Maria A. Smith, and Sam, the negro*, were not at the time of my trial, and are not now, persons of truth and veracity, and that they ought not to be believed ; Mr. Enoch Baker swears it, James Cook, Esq. Denison Palmer, Esq. Mr. Peleg Rose, Mr. John C. Baker, all swear it, and this committee must think that all these respectable men are perjured, or that the said Maria and negro, ought not to be believed, of course that I am innocent, and ought not to pay the note. The present testimony of the said Asenath, is supported by other testimony which cannot be controverted. She swears that in the summer of 1817, and long before, she was in the habit of keeping private company with a certain young physician ; that about the first day of July, 1817, he came there and staid all night ; and that she was then begotten with that child, which his father and others induced her in 1819 to swear falsely upon me. Mr. Perry Clark swears that she lived in the same house with him ; that he knows a certain young physician was in the habit of coming there, and of being in her private company ; that he came there about the first of July, 1817, or just before he went his journey to the westward, and staid all night ; and he personally knew that

he came out of her bed-chamber at that time, between break of day and sunrise; that he had no knowledge or belief that I was there during that summer; that he never heard her or any of the family accuse me until 1819; that Halsey and Downer, father of the young doctor, came there and staid all night, and took her into a private bed-room alone; that the next morning Halsey dictated, and Downer wrote these accusations against me; that Lanman was shut up a long time with her *alone in his east chamber*, and then told him that it would be *the best and most honarable thing that she could do to charge these crimes upon me;* that she should be protected, it should never hurt her, that she need not, and should not be called upon to testify *pnblicly* in the case. Curtis Hickox, Esq. swears, that on *that very day*, when I was accused of committing that crime with her in Griswold, I was at his house in Washington; that he there and then paid me $40 in money, and took my receipt in full, *dated on that very day*, 100 *miles from Griswold*, and sent a copy of it. Doct. Beardslee swears that on that day, and for some time before, I was with him in Kent, and was not in Griswold. Gentlemen, all this evidence is now legally before you, and will you, can you in conscience say that I am guilty of begetting Asenath C. Smith with child, in Griswold, on the first day of July, 1817, or at any other time? Consider the evidence. I beseech you, and make that report which you can justify before the bar of God, and the bar of your own consciences. She swears that she lost her child by sickness, by infirmity, or by accident. Doct. Downing, who delivered her, swears, and it is now in evidence before this committee, that he saw no mark of violence upon it, or its mother; that it might be lost by sickness, or by infirmity, or by accident. Mr. Perry Clark, who lived in the same house with her, swears, and it is now in evidence before the committee, that in the summer and fall of 1817, he well remembers that the said Asenath was very sickly, weak, and unwell, and had fits, and particularly on the week before she was said to be delivered, and in one of her fits she met with an accident of falling from the bed on to the floor. Does the committee believe this testi-

mony? if so, the testimony of Asenath is supported, and I am acquitted.

But, may it please the committee, there is another ground on which I pray to have my note given up, and that is, that I was partially and unfairly tried. It is now in proof that the principal witness in this case, the witness on whose oath I was bound over for trial, and on whose oath I ought to have been condemned or acquitted, was rejected by the court on the ground that she was not offered sooner. I claim to be a man of some understanding. If the decision of Judge Brainard in this case had been adhered to, no testimony would have been admitted until the main facts charged, had been first proved; and then Asenath must have been introduced by them, and she could have told the whole story, and they could not impeach or contradict their own witness; the all-night visit, the private bed room conference, and the east chamber agreement would have come into view. Asenath says that they overpersuaded and induced her to swear these crimes falsely upon me. That she did swear them falsely upon me is undeniable; for she swore that I committed this crime with her in Griswold, on the first day of July, 1817. Is this true? Curtis Hickox, Esq. swears, that *on that very day* I was at his house in Washington, 100 miles from her, and from Griswold. Dr. Beardslee swears, that *on that very day*, and for some time before, I was in Kent, and not in Griswold. Mr. Clark swears that he has no knowledge that I was at his house, where she lived, *during that whole summer*, and for several months knows that I was not there; that he knows that another man was there and staid all night, and he personally knew that he came out of her bed chamber at that time, between break of day and sunrise, so that it is undeniable, *that I was falsely accused*, and she was induced to swear these crimes falsely upon me. But the question is, Did Halsey, Downer, and Lanman overpersuade and induce her to swear falsely? The misfortune happened to her in 1817,—in 1819, Halsey and Downer went there for the purpose of getting her to swear against me—she was taken into a private bed room alone, they promised her honor, friendship, protection, safety, and even secrecy if she would swear against me—Halsey dictated the story and

Downer wrote it. Soon after, Lanman went there, about eight miles, was shut up with her alone for many hours; he said it would be the best and most honorable thing that she could do to swear against me; that she should be protected; that it never should hurt her; that she need not and should not be called upon to testify *publicly* in the case. She did swear! and he called upon her to swear publicly, and *she swore falsely*, and she now swears *that they* overpersuaded her *to swear falsely;* and that her false swearing, which has ruined me unjustly, has caused her more sorrow, tears and trouble, than all the transactions of her life besides. Gentlemen, these things are in legal proof before you, and can you now say with a good conscience, that the grounds of my memorial are not well supported? Can you say with truth that she did not swear falsely against me? Can you in a good conscience say that these men did not overpersuade and wickedly induce her to swear falsely? and can you say that the note to pay the cost of this abominable iniquity ought not to be given up? If on my trial I had brought forward this witness they could have proved what she swore falsely against me when I was bound over; I could not have contradicted or impeached my own witness, and I should have been condemned by her former testimony, and in this way I could not have the constitutional right of confronting the principal witness against me; and on this ground I claim that my trial has been unconstitutional, partial and very unfair. Gentlemen, I appeal to your consciences, I appeal to the common understanding of all mankind, would any public officer, would any man who wanted nothing but public justice, have done as these men have? And will you uphold them? will you extort from me more than $630, to pay for the dreadful and scandalous falsehood charged upon me, for the unspeakably ruinous and distressing persecution which has been inflicted on me, and on my innocent children, and parishes by their means? Will it be just, will it be honorable to Connecticut? I claim that my trial was partial and unfair, in that collateral testimony was admitted before the facts charged were proved; in that Asenath C. Smith, the principal witness, was not called on to support, if she could, the prosecution. I claim that my trial

was partial and unfair, in that the court refused to send for Mr. Lester Clark, whose testimony was necessary in my defence. What can be more oppressive and unjust, than to call a person before you as a criminal, refuse him the evidence of his innocence, when it is within your power, and within a few miles of you, and then condemn him to prison, to infamy, to utter ruin, in the want of it. Has this thing been done in Connecticut? Mr John C. Baker swears it, and it is true. I called upon the court to send for Lester Clark, as a witness necessary in my defence; the court declined, and he was not there. Now, you, gentlemen, are appointed by both houses of the General Assembly to report on this case, will you say that it is fair and I ought to pay for it?

I claim that my trial was unconstitutional, not only in that I was deprived of the privilege of confronting the principal witness against me, the witness on whose oath I was bound over for trial, not only in that the judge refused to send for a witness necessary in the defence of the accused, not only in that I was put in jeopardy twice for the same supposed offence but in that the trial was put off on the part of the prosecution for almost eighteen months, whereas the constitution provides that every person who is accused shall have a speedy trial. I claim that the trial was absolutely unlawful, in that *it was more than three years after the crimes were said to have been committed*, and almost two years before the prosecution was commenced. It is in proof before this committee, attested by Capt. Townsend, Esq. Cook, and Mr. Rose, that important papers and documents, the undeniable evidence of my innocence, were delivered to the justice at the binding over; that on trial they were called for; that they were withheld, and that the court proceeded without them. Will you, gentlemen, report that this was fair, and ought not to be inquired into, and that I ought to pay for it and be imprisoned and ruined in this way? To take a clergyman from his beloved children and friends, from his parishes, consisting of more than 2000 souls; where for more than six years there had not been a voice or a vote against him, except one man, to take him from the pulpit, and from the altar of God, and the pledges of divine love, by the most false and infamous accusa-

tions, to refuse him the privilege of confronting the principal witness against him ; to refuse to send for a witness necessary in his defence ; to put off the trial for eighteen months ; to withhold and conceal important papers and documents, the undeniable evidence of his innocence, and in this way to proceed to try him, to condemn him, to imprison him, to disgrace him and to ruin him? What can be worse? and I submit it to this committee to say, if from the evidence now before them, these things have not deen practised upon me, and abundantly proved? and will you, gentlemen, say, because they are done *by the Honorable Superior Court*, I shall not have a hearing in these things, that they shall not be reported to the Honorable General Assembly? But I pray you to give up my note, not only because it was unjust that I should give it, in that the charges against me were undeniably false, and are so now in proof before this committee ; not only because my trial was unconstitutional, unlawful, partial and unfair ; not only because my condemnation was unjust, and my imprisonment cruel and wicked ; but because it was extorted from me in duresse, extorted from me while I was in prison, and could not help myself, it was taking the advantage of my situation, and as much compulsion as it would have been to put a knife to my throat, or a pistol to my breast ; in that it was demanded and taken as the only condition of my liberty, and perhaps my life. Capt. Townsend swears expressly, and it is now in evidence before you, that he was present when the note was signed ; that I then remonstrated in warm terms, and refused to sign it ; that the State's Attorney said that I might then lie in jail, and went off in anger ; that I said it was perfectly unjust ; (and I think that I have abundantly proved by Asenath C. Smith herself, by Dr Downing, Mr. Perry Clark, Curtis Hickox, Esq. Dr. Beardslee and others, that it really was so,) he swears that I then declared that I would sign it only to obtain my liberty, and perhaps my life ; and in this way I did sign it, hoping and believing that the Honorable General Assembly would afford me relief ; and gentlemen, I now request you to give up, in your report, my note on each, and on all the before

mentioned grounds; and in justice to me, to yourselves and to the public, I hope and believe you must and will do it.

By the Chairman.—Have you any documents relative to your former character and standing? Ans. I have, may it please your honor; but not directed expressly to this General Assembly. Here is the deposition of Mr. Thomas Wells, (*see page* 160.) of Hiram Haughton, (*see page* 101.) &c. &c.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

The joint Committee to whom was referred the Memorial of Ammi Rogers, of Hebron, in the county of Tolland, complaining that he has been partially and unfairly tried, unjustly condemned and imprisoned, and wickedly and cruelly deprived of almost every thing which could make life desirable, by the Honorable Superior Court holden at New London, A. D. 1820, and praying the General Assembly to grant him a hearing in the premises: Respectfully REPORT, that in the opinion of your committee, for the General Assembly to grant him a hearing on the broad basis required in the Memorial, and to re-judge a case already decided by the proper tribunal would be a manifest encroachment upon the jurisdiction defined by law, and assigned by the Constitution to the Judiciary. They therefore recommend that your Memorialist have liberty to withdraw his Memorial. All which is respectfully submitted.

Signed by order. DAVID HILL, *Chairman.*

Hartford, May, 1823.

The foregoing is a true copy of the original Report on file.

Examined by me, THOMAS DAY, *Secretary.*

There is no report of the committee, nor pretence suggested, that I have not been falsely accused, partially and unfairly tried, unjustly condemned and imprisoned, and wickedly and cruelly deprived of almost every thing which could make life desirable, and a note of more than $630, to pay the cost and expense extorted from me on peril of my liberty and life. I say the committee have not pretended that all this was not proved, and that all this was not true: but that *it would be a manifest encroachment upon the Judiciary*, for the General Assembly to grant a re-hearing; and they say nothing of the note, whether they will give it up or not. Good God of

heaven, has it come to this! can the citizens of Connecticut be treated in this way and have no redress!

O, Merciful God, and Heavenly Father, who hast taught me in thy holy word that thou doest not willingly afflict or grieve the children of men; look with pity, I beseech thee, upon the sorrows of thy servant, who am now under affliction and persecution. In thy wisdom thou hast seen fit to suffer me to be visited with trouble and to have distress brought upon me. Remember me, O Lord, in mercy, sanctify thy fatherly corrections to me, endue my soul with patience under my afflictions, and with resignation to thy blessed will: comfort me with a sense of thy goodness, lift up the light of thy countenance upon me, and give me peace through Jesus Christ our Lord. Grant, O Lord, that all my sufferings here upon earth for the testimony of thy truth, and a good conscience, may terminate in thy glory and the salvation of my own soul; may I look up to heaven and behold thy glory which shall be revealed hereafter; may I learn to love and bless my persecutors. Father of mercies, please to forgive them and to turn their hearts; please to bless and preserve all Christian rulers and magistrates, give them grace to execute justice and to maintain truth; please to relieve the distressed, protect the innocent and make their innocence to appear; bless all mankind with every needful gift, convert the unconverted, and fill the world with thy glory; cast the bright beams of thy light upon thy church, that we may so walk in the light of thy truth here that we may at length attain everlasting life through Jesus Christ our Lord.—Amen.

Our Father who art in Heaven, &c.

Just Judge of Heaven, against my foes,
Do thou assert my injured right;
O set me free, my God, from those
Who in deceit and wrong delight,
Since thou art still my only stay—
Why leav'st thou me in deep distress—
Why go I mourning all the day,
Whilst me insulting foes oppress.—[43*d Psalm.*

CHAPTER XV.

A LAW SUIT,

Before Abner Hendee, *Esq. a Justice of Peace in and for Tolland county. Connecticut: at his office in Hebron, on the first day of October*, 1823.

Ammi Rogers, vs. ——.

This is an action on the case, in which the Plaintiff demands of the Defendant $ 5 damage and his cost, (this is all a Justice could give,) and it is brought before him to have a speedy trial,) for saying falsely and maliciously that the book (see page 193) purporting to be a report of the trial of Ammi Rogers, in 1820. printed by Samuel Green, was true, and that the witnesses against him testified the truth and ought to be believed. On trial the defendant acknowledged that he uttered these words but plead no malice. The plaintiff replied, *that the words were false*, and that *falsehood implied malice*, and put himself on the court for trial, and the defendant likewise.

Mr. Lester Clark.—His father married Asenath and Maria A. Smith's mother's sister, and lived in the same house with them, and is the witness that the court, at New-London, refused to send for. He testified that he personally knew that many things stated in that book were *absolutely false*, particularly that Mr. Rogers never was shut up at their house, in a chamber alone, with Asenath C. Smith, with fastened doors, and no one else admitted into the room from Tuesday till Saturday. 2d, That he well remembers that in the fall of 1817, Asenath was very sickly, weak, unwell and had fits, and on one occasion fell from the bed on to the floor, and he offered to go after a Doctor for her; that her mother objected; that on the same night his father was taken sick and he did go after Dr. Downing, who came and bled him. 3d, That Dr. Downer and Col. Halsey did come to their house and stay all night in the spring of 18.9; that the next morning there was writing done there, but he does not know what it was, and that he never

heard the said Asenath or any of the family accuse Mr. Rogers before that time. 4th, That James Lanman, Esq. did come to their house, soon after Halsey and Downer came there and staid all night, and was shut up alone, with the said Asenath, in their east chamber, *for a considerable length of time.* 5th, That he never knew nor heard such an agonizing shriek at their house as Maria had described, not till after Col. Halsey and Downer came there and staid, and he did not believe it was true. 6th, That he knew that Dr. George Downer had been in the habit of keeping private company with Asenath C. Smith; that about the first of July, 1817, he came there and staid all night and he put out his horse. 7th, That he heard said Maria confess to Mr. Rogers, that what she had testified against him before Esq. Coit, *was false*, and she was sorry she had said it. And I now testify that the general character of the said Maria is not equal to that of people in general as to truth and veracity: and that Sam Wheeler, the negro, who many years has lived within about forty rods of me, is a thief and a liar, and was so at the time of the trial of Mr. Rogers, and this is his general character: and further the deponent saith not. LESTER CLARK.

New-London county. ss Griswold, August 25, 1823.

Subscribed and sworn before

JEDEDIAH BARSTOW, *Justice of Peace.*

Perry Clark, testified the same as in page 186, and that he personally knew some part of the testimony of Maria A. Smith, on the trial of Mr. Rogers, as contained in said book, was *absolutely false;* particularly it is not true that Mr. Rogers was, in the month of October, 1817, or at any other time, shut up with Asenath C. Smith at my house, as is there set forth—I know that Mr. Geer did constantly, four, and sometimes six times a day, pass through that chamber; and that Maria herself, and her mother, and Asenath, must and did pass through that chamber, back and forth, to the room where they slept, and I never heard of any shriek being heard in that chamber until about two years afterwards, &c. &c. and I testify, that Maria A. Smith is, in my opinion, *the smoothest and most plausible liar* that I ever knew! and that in point of truth & veracity, her general character is not now, and at and long be-

fore the said trial was not on a par with that of mankind in general, &c. I testify, that I consider Sam Wheeler, the negro, who has lived and was brought up within about 40 rods of me, to have been, at the time of the said trial, and long before, and since, *a most notorious liar, and a thief*, and I have no knowledge of ever having sent any one into my chamber after a bag at any time. [*see pages* 95 *and* 124.] for I always keep my bags, not in my chamber, but in my corn house. &c.

PERRY CLARK.

Griswold, Sept. 10, 1823.—Subscribed and sworn before me,

JEDEDIAH BARSTOW, *Justice of Peace.*

James Cook, Esq. testified that he had examined a book purporting to be a report of my trial, printed by Samuel Green; that it contained a false report of the said trial. 1st, That not E. B. Downing, but Elisha Geer, was the first witness, and his testimony was objected to, &c. 2d, That it represented him and others as testifying that on said trial which was not true, and which they never did testify. [Here he stated many particulars of the falsehoods and misrepresentations contained in that book.] 3d. He testified that the general moral characters of the said Maria and Sam, the negro, were very bad, and particularly as to truth and veracity, and were so at the time of said trial. &c.

Subscribed and sworn to, in due form of law, in Preston, September 8th, 1823, before

WILLIAM WILLIAMS, *Justice of Peace.*

The seventeen objections, page 193, were fully proved to be well founded, and true.

Mr. Enoch Baker, Mr. Samuel Dorrance, and many others, testified that they personally knew that the said book was false, and that the characters of the principal witnesses against me, in said trial, were bad, and particularly as to *truth and veracity*, and that they ought not to have been believed. Would any other state's attorney, except James Lanman, have gone to the house of Elisha Geer, eight miles, and used the means which he did, to form such an information, and brought forward such witnesses as Sam, the negro, and Maria, to support it, against a respectable clergyman, —one who had at least two thousand souls under his care,

[see the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee's letter, page 73,] and where the wardens made oath, that for six years then last past, they had never known or heard of a vote or a voice against him in his parish, except one man, (see page 100.) Would any other Judge, except Asa Chapman, have admitted such witnesses, and conducted the trial as he did? Do you ask why was all this? I answer, turn to pages 37 and 38, read that, and what follows, and you have the answer.

May it please the court, I have brought this suit, not to rob a neighbor of his money or to distress him; but to convince him and the world, that the book *is a scandalous and malicious libel*; and I think I have proved it to be so, by the most indubitable and incontestible testimony. The defendant moved to have the court adjourn, on the ground, that he wanted the testimony of Constance F. Daniels, the reputed author of said book; it was agreed to, and the court adjourned to the 5th day of November, 1823, then to meet at the same place at 10 o'clock, A. M.

The said Daniels had been called upon, and acknowledged himself the author of said BOOK, and on the 19th day of November, 1822, in the town of Chatham, in Connecticut, before Ralph Smith, Esq. a Justice of the Peace, made solemn oath, *that he could not recollect whether the testimony of Maria A. Smith was stated with precision or not*, and all his answers were so equivocal and evasive, (though sworn to tell the whole truth,) that no satisfaction could be obtained from him. (his poverty and insignificance were his security.) On the 5th day of November, 1823, the court was called according to adjournment; the defendant did not appear, and the case went against him by default.

N. B. And it is decreed, that whoever shall give, sell, or lend, or in any way circulate *that scandalous and malicious libel*, purporting to be a report of the trial of Ammi Rogers, printed by Samuel Green, in New-London, in 1820, is liable to prosecution. *Take Notice!!*

AGAINST LYING AND FALSE SWEARING.

The Eternal God hath declared, in thundering and lightning, in the most solemn and awful manner, from mount Sinai, (and cursed be every one who continueth not in all

things written in the book of the law to do them,) that, *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.* Cooly and deliberately to call the God of all worlds to witness and to sanction that which we know to be false, or that which we do not know to be true; or to induce others to do the same, is profane, is impious, is Heaven-daring, is God-defying! O, how dreadful! how shocking! how dangerous for time and for eternity! It hardens the soul against all the impressions of divine love and fear; it banishes the influence of divine grace from our hearts; it fixes upon our souls the black, the horrible seal of damnation! it dissolves all civil compact. Our courts of law ought to render judgment according to evidence; if that evidence be false, the judgment will be false. And as it respects individuals, how unjust, how cruel, how abusive is false witness. It deprives us of life, and of every thing which can make life desirable—by it, I have suffered, and by it you may suffer. No character, no honor, no profession, no property, nothing valuable can be safe! Do I see my beloved father or mother, do I see a dear brother or a charming sister, do I see, O, Gracious God! do I see my wife or daughter, by perjury and by falsehood, torn from my bleeding bosom, from every thing honorable, pleasant, gay and cheerful; dragged to a court of justice, stript of honor, character and happiness; loaded with indelible infamy and disgrace; my fondest hopes are blasted, my animating expectations are cut off, all my comfort is gone, and with unspeakable sorrow and anguish my gray hairs are brought down to the grave!! And what is the cause? Oh, it is false swearing and perjury! Thou fell monster of hell! what hast thou not done! Begone, get thee hence! begone forever thou child of the devil! What can make any person appear so perfectly ridiculous, hateful and contemptible, as to be detected in a disgraceful, mean lie? There is not a decent person on earth who would not resent even the suspicion of it; there is not the meanest scoundrel who walks the streets of New-York, or any other place, who would not be ashamed of it. Liars and hypocrites are to have their portion in a bad place, in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone! The devil himself is said to have been a liar from the beginning, and liars and

perjured persons are the children of the devil. I love and pity their souls, but I despise their conduct. If it be possible, O, Father in Heaven, to forgive so great, so heinous, so destructive, so disgraceful sins against thee, and against all human safety and happiness, look upon them in mercy, make them sensible of their crimes, and bring them to repentance, and to a better use of their tongues.

Let a person possess all the wealth of the Indies, or all the gold of Peru; let him be honored with all the offices and stations in the power of men to bestow, yet, if he be destitute of truth. *he is rotten at the core*, he is detestible in the sight of God and man—look at him! see a liar! a false swearer! a perjured person! How mean he is! how despicable! how dreadful! I advise parents to teach their children, above all other qualifications, the love and practice of truth; and to impress their minds, as much as possible, with an inward abhorrence and detestation of falsehood and misrepresentation. If a person be never so poor, if misfortunes surround him on every side, if he be afflicted in mind, body and estate, and is overwhelmed in sorrows and troubles, yet, if he be a man of *truth*, if what he says may be relied on, he will be respected, he will be comforted and relieved. We have a silent monitor within us, unless, by falsehood and perjury we have banished him, and he will inform us what is true, and what is not. In this case the words of Pope are excellent, viz.

What conscience dictates to be done,
Or warns me not to do,
This teach me more than hell to shun,
That, more than Heaven pursue.

Saint Paul says, our rejoicing is this, the testimony of a good conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity we have had our conversation in the world. But conscience is not an infallible guide: how often have I conscienciously, and sincerely thought I was right, and afterwards been convinced that I was wrong! and even in matters of religion, our consciences are greatly influenced by education and custom! Still it is the best guide in the world when regulated by the holy Scriptures, and the best information which we can obtain. O, Almighty and Eternal God, make me, and all man-

kind, I beseech thee, at all times, to love those things which thou dost command, and to desire those things which thou dost promise; that so, among the sundry and manifold changes of the world, our hearts may surely there be fixed, where true joys are to be found, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen. "Our Father who art in Heaven," &c.

CHAPTER XVI.

The witnesses testified before the court, and their testimony was supported by the testimony of others, that Col. Halsey and Dr. Downer, and James Lanman, Esq. did overpersuade and hire them to testify against me as they did before the court, and that it was not true, and they knew it. Now stand still and see the judgments of Heaven upon these wicked men:—In less than three years,

Col. Jeremiah Halsey. who had been a noted lawyer, a man of great property and distinction, has become a poor, miserable vagabond; he has had the numb palsey, his mouth drawn on one side, he spits and drules; he got drunk, fell from his horse, was taken up out of compassion, at Mr. Abel Spicer's, where he lay all night, wet the bed and dirtied himself; his son-in-law turned him out of door, he has not a house to shelter his head; a demand of $20 was offered to me against him by a Mr. Kimbal for one of these books—only fifty cents.

Dr. Avery Downer, of Preston, was once a noted Physician. loooked upon to be a man of good property, well respected and promoted in the town. In less than two years after I came out of Jail, every cent of his property was sold at the post by the Sheriff; he has not a shelter of his own to cover his head, and now goes from grog-shop to grog-shop, a poor, miserable outcast in society, by most of his acquaintances hated and despised.

James Lanman. Esq. was educated in the same college and at the same time with me; he has been a noted lawyer, a State's Attorney, and a Senator of the United States. Since these false accusations against me, he has been publicly burnt

in effigy in the city of Hartford, hung in effigy in the city of New-London, drowned in effigy in Norwich, and *publicly whipped in his own person!* in Norwich Landing, by a Mr. Story, in presence of hundreds of his own citizens, and not a man to take his part, except his own son, who said to him: Go home, father, for you have more enemies here, than there are bees in a hive. He has been refused a seat in Congress, &c. left out of office, and I know no man who has become more universally hated and despised, by all classes of people, in the town where he lives, than James Lanman, and it is said he is more than $5,000, worse than nothing, as to property.

Judge Chapman, who conducted the trial, and pronounced sentence upon me, soon after sickened, languished, died, and is now in his grave!

Asenath C. Smith, has left the United States, and I do not know what has become of her.

Maria A. Smith, (the supposed sister of Asenath; because the circumstances of her birth were such, that her father never would own her; he went to sea and has never returned,) after my trial returned to Springfield, with Dr. Ira Daniels, (who was very anxious to have me condemned,) his property was all attached, his friends had forsaken him, he fled; she returned to Griswold, destitute, despised and neglected—she then went to the city of New-York, and it is said, supported herself at the expense of her chastity; returned to Groton, sickly and diseased; John Packer took her part, and took her in, and he has since neglected his own wife, and children, and has had a bastard by his wife's sister—Maria married a poor, drunken fellow, and lives very unhappy.

Sam Wheeler, the negro, has, since my trial, been convicted of breaking open a store, and stealing, in North Stonington; and is now justly suffering two years imprisonment in New-Gate State Prison, at Simsbury Mines.

John P. Trott, the Foreman of the Jury who pronounced me guilty, soon after my trial, sickened, languished and died, and is now in his grave! Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Is it not wonderful! is it not astonishing to view and consider the judgements of Heaven, which have attended

the perpetrators of this horrid plan, these persecutors of injured innocence! and although they have made me enemies among those who will judge a case without examination or knowing it; yet what has become of all these abominable conspirators. I do not believe that people always receive all their punishment in this world; I am not a universalist, yet great plagues remain for the ungodly. Elias Brewster, who was called to support the character of Maria and Sam, had an amiable wife, who hung herself the very next winter, and there is hardly an individual among them, who has taken part against me in this case, who has not been obliged to drink the bitter cup of affliction. Look at them! What were they once? What are they now!

As to my own conduct and character, *actions speak louder than words.* I was ordained and settled in the state of New-York, and remained there in the ministry about ten or twelve years, and was dismissed after the death of my wife, with great reluctance, and only at my own request, (*see page* 35,) and without the least fault found in me. I was then settled in Branford, the place where I was born and brought up; where my parents and grand-parents lived, and where I had been known from my infancy, without a dissenting voice or vote; and with a larger salary than they had, at that time, ever given to any other clergyman. If there had been any thing, in my youthful days, against me, or my family, or my connections, would there be no one to lift a hand or stir a tongue against my settlement there as a minister? After I had been gone from Ballston about three years, a meeting was called, and in a congregation of more than 700 souls, a very unanimous vote was passed (only two dissenting votes) for me to return and again become their minister, with the same salary I had before, viz. £216 a year; and if there had been any thing against me in the county of Saratoga, would they want me back again?

Jacob Bunniel, of Branford, New-Haven county, and state of Connecticut, of lawful age deposeth and saith, that he has been for many years one of the wardens of St. Andrew's church in Branford; that he was personally and well acquainted with the parents and grand-parents of the Rev.

Ammi Rogers before he was born; that they were always considered among the most respectable for character and property of any of the inhabitants of this town; this deponent has been personally and well acquainted with the Rev. Ammi Rogers, who was born and brought up within about one mile of the place where this deponent has lived, ever since the said Rogers was born; that he never knew any thing unbecoming in the conduct or character of the said Rogers; and that there never was, to his knowledge, any blemish fixed upon his character in this town; that previous to his ordination, this deponent and the committee of the said Episcopal society in Branford, did sign and send to the Bishop and standing committee in the state of New-York, a recommendation for the said Rogers to be ordained. And this deponent says, that some years after this, the said Rogers was *unanimously chosen to be the minister of this parish;* that the congregation were united under him as their minister; that he never knew nor heard of any person in this town who had any just cause of complaint against said Rogers, either as a minister or as a man: and further this deponent saith not.

JACOB BUNNIEL.

Subscribed and sworn in due form of law, in Branford, before BENJAMIN PAGE, Justice of Peace.

To the Convention of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut.

We, the undersigned, respectfully shew, that the Rev. Ammi Rogers was born of respectable parents, and brought up in this town and neighborhood, and that we have been constantly and well acquainted with him from his infancy; before he entered college, while at college, and ever since he has been in the ministry; and at no period of his life has any blemish been fixed upon his character; that he now is, and always has been, highly esteemed in this town, and that the church in this town was never so united and so prosperous as while under his ministry.

SAMUEL RUSSEL, } *Wardens of Trinity Church*
ISAAC HOADLEY, } *in Branford.*

Bishop Jarvis himself, my enemy and persecutor, gave a public pledge and assurance, in behalf of himself and of all the Episcopal clergy in Connecticut, that *my character and*

authority were good. [see page 40.] Mr. Joel Chatfield, of Derby, in whose family I and my children, had boarded many years, gave the most abundant testimony in favor of my good conduct and good character, [see page 100.] The Rev. Mr. Blakeslee gives official assurance to bishop Hobart, that to speak with caution, I had at least 2000 souls in my care, [see page 73.] And the wardens of the church in Hebron make solemn oath, that for six years then last past, they had never known or heard of a voice or a vote against me in my parish, except one man, [see page 100.] If a minister can build up seven new parishes, and rear into life two old ones, [see page 73.] and have 2000 souls in his care, and the wardens swear, that for six years, then last past, they have never known or heard of a voice or a vote against him, except one man, ; I suspect he must be a good minister and an exemplary man. Let bishop Hobart, if he can, bring forward a clergyman in his diocess that can compare with this.! I boast not, but am humble before God ; but I appeal to the whole county of Saratoga, and to every parish, and to every place which has been in my ministerial care : Were you ever more blessed, were you ever more prosperous and happy ?

Elisha Miller, Joseph Van Kirk, and Eleazer Dows, inhabitants of the county of Saratoga and state of New-York, being convened and duly sworn, depose and say, that they have been personally and well acquainted with the Rev. Ammi Rogers for nearly twenty years last past ; that they were vestrymen of Christ's church, in Ballston, a great part of the time the said Rogers preached in said church, which was about ten or twelve years ; that his general conduct and character were good ; that he was dismissed from said church with great reluctance, and without the least fault found in him ; that at the time they regretted, and still do regret, his leaving them ; and the congregation manifested the same disposition ; [see page 35 ;] that about three years after Mr. Rogers left Ballston, they were present at a very full meeting of the congregation of said church in Ballston, [the number of souls there, belonging to that parish, were about 700, and the number of communicants about 280,] at which meeting a very unanimous vote was passed, only two dissenting votes, for him

to return to Ballston, and again become their minister: and further the deponents say not.

ELISHA MILLER, ELEAZER DOWS,
JOSEPH VAN KIRK.

Ballston, county of Saratoga, State of New-York, January 24, 1811.

Personally appeared Elisha Miller, Joseph Van Kirk, and Eleazer Dows, who subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition, in due form of law, before me, ADAM COMSTOCK, one of the Judges &c.

Messrs. Joshua Bloore. (my wife's father, and John Bloore, her brother,) Samuel Holister, Rueben Smith, John Higby, Ira Betts, Levi Benedict, &c. inhabitants of Ballston, depose, and on their oaths say, that they have been personally and well acquainted with the Rev. Ammi Rogers for about twenty years last past; that they have severally considered him a faithful minister, and remarkably attentive to the several duties of his ministerial office; that they do respectively consider him a man of truth, of honor, and of strict integrity; that they all did, and still do, regret his leaving them to reside in another state; and that they do not consider him justly liable to reproach.

Ballston, January 24, 1811.

Subscribed and sworn before

ADAM COMSTOCK, one of the Judges, &c.

David Roberts and Augustus Pullin, wardens of St. James' church, in Milton, subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing facts, and *before the same authority.*

Capt. John St. John, James Vail, Nathaniel Edward's, Joseph Blackleach, Lewis Scott, Peter Hendrick. John Smith, Burr Hendrick, Edad Gurnsey, Frederick Weed, &c. of Greenfield, county of Saratoga, made solemn oath to the truth of the same facts with Mr. Bloore and others. Also, Messrs. Abel Pullin, Elijah Curtiss, Caleb Northrop, John Bennett, of Galway, Aaron Van Ostrand, of Milton, Stephen King of Northumberland, Jonathan R. Spencer, James Valentine, Patrick Callaghan, Frederick Valentine, Samuel Frink, James Cunningham, Henry Cunningham, W. W. Bostwick, John Callaghan, &c. of Charlton, in the county

of Saratoga—William Bradshaw, Thomas Haskins, wardens of the church in Stillwater—Ebenezer Patrick, William Patrick, Noadiah Moody, Henry Metcalf, and others—Henry Walton, Thomas Smith, Edmund Jennings, Evan Davis, and others—about 70 members of the Episcopal church, met by appointment in different parts of the county of Saratoga, and made solemn oath to the truth of the facts contained in the foregoing deposition of Joshua Bloore and others, and then the Judge himself gave the following deposition, viz.

Adam Comstock, of Hadley, in the county of Saratoga, &c. deposeth and saith, that he is personally and well acquainted with most of the persons in said county, whose depositions have been taken before him as Judge, &c. that so far as his knowledge of them, collectively and individually, extends, he considers them to rank among the most respectable of the inhabitants in this county; and that their characters stand unimpeachable; that he has been a considerable length of time acquainted with the said Ammi Rogers, and always considered him a person of good moral character; that he has made particular inquiry, (especially in going round the county to take the said depositions,) for his own satisfaction, in all which tour in the said county, and inquiry into the subject, [I then had about 4000 souls in my care, in the county of Saratoga, and had then baptized more than 1700,] he never has found any one person, to express any one sentiment unfavorable to the moral character of the said Rogers, and that he considers his general and moral character in this county, to be unimpeachable: and further he saith not.

ADAM COMSTOCK.

State of New-York, ss. county of Saratoga, April 9, 181[illegible].

Personally appeared the above named Adam Comstock, one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas, who being duly cautioned, subscribed and made solemn oath to the truth of the foregoing deposition, in due form of law, before me, SALMON CHILD, *First Judge of said Court.*

From 1811 to 1813, I resided and preached in that part of Saybrook in Connecticut, called Puttepaug, now called Essex, where they gave the fullest testimony in favor of my faithfulness and ability as a minister, and of my exemplary and good

conduct as a man. From 1813 to 1819, I resided in Hebron, and preached there and in the eastern part of Connecticut, where the Rev. Mr. Blakeslee says, that to speak with caution, my parishes embraced a number of not less than 2000 souls; (*see page* 73,) the wardens in Hebron make solemn oath, that my conduct and character were good, and that in their parishes, for six years then last past, they had never known or heard of a voice or a vote against me, except one man. (*see pages* 100 *and* 101.) Can Bishop Hobart or any of his clergy produce more satisfactory testimony of their good conduct, and character than this? In Jewitt City, within one mile of the place where these crimes were said to have been committed in 1817; the wardens and vestrymen passed a unanimous vote, in 1819, two years after, in which they say; "*We are not sensible, neither do we beleive, that any blame or misconduct can be justly imputed to Mr. Rogers.*" Signed by John Scolfield, Charles Fanning, Simeon Lathrop. James Burnham, Christopher Avery, Enoch Baker, Peleg Fry, and others.

Preston, Conn. April 5th. 1820.

We the undersigned having been appointed a committee, by and in behalf of St. James' church, in Poquatanic, [in Preston,] to inquire into the truth of certain evil reports circulated by Doct. Downer, Col. Halsey, and others, against the Rev. Ammi Rogers, and on which a prosecution has been instituted; do certify and report, that we have been personally to the house, where the ill conduct was said to have transpired, that we made diligent inquiry of the person implicated, of all the family, and of the neighbors; that we have also attended the court of inquiry and the court of trial, and that we are fully satisfied that the said reports [now charges] are false, and ought not to be regarded.

JAMES COOK,
PELEG ROSE, } Committee.

At an annual meeting of the parish of St. James's church, in Poquatanic, legally warned and held in said church, this 5th day of April, 1820, *Voted unanimously*, that in the opinion of this meeting, the papers issued by Bishop Jarvis against the Rev. Ammi Rogers, are wholly unconstitutional and uncanonical; and whereas the said Rogers has performed di-

vine service, and preached in this church, a considerable part of the time since 1814, we think it due to him, to ourselves, and to the public, to say, that so far as we know, his conduct in this parish as a minister and a man, has been perfectly unexceptionable.

A true copy of record—Attest,

EBENEZER GEER. *Clerk.*

Blanford, Mass. May 29th, 1820. We, the committee of the Protestant Episcopal society in Blanford, do certify, that the Rev. Ammi Rogers, has occasionally performed divine service and preached in this society, for ten years last past.—That for sometime past, and at the present time, he is employed by this society to perform divine service and to preach here, a part of the time ; and that we consider his character and his standing, as a minister and as a man, to be good.

ELI KNOX,
MARCUS GIBBS, } Society's Com.

We, the undersigned, inhabitants of the town of Situate and Foster, in Rhode-Island, certify that we have been personally acquainted with the Rev. Ammi Rogers, for about one year last past, and for several months last past he has resided and preached in our neighborhood, and that so far as we know or believe, his conduct as a minister, and as a man, and as a good citizen, has been exemplary and irreproachable. Dated March 21st, 1825.

(Signed.) Edward L. Smith, Ebenezer Barney, George W. Dixon, Z. Young, Reuben Hammond, Eddy Walker, John Randal, Abraham Angel, Abel Hopkins, Nehemiah Angel, jun. and others.

In May, 1825, I returned to the county of Saratoga, and have preached in that county and neighborhood ; and I know no one, who I think would not certify that so far as they know, I had conducted in an exemplary manner.

At a regular communication of FRANKLIN LODGE, No. 37, duly convened in their hall, and opened in due form, this 21st day of February, A. L. 5826.—Voted, that the Worshipful Master, the Senior and Junior Wardens, and Brothers John Monro, Peter Roe, and Isaac Johnson, be a committee to in-

inquire into the conduct, character, and standing of our Rev. Brother Ammi Rogers, and to report this evening.

We, the committee, to whom was referred the case of our Rev. Brother Ammi Rogers, respectfully report, that after strict trial and due examination of him, of his documents, and of the records of this Lodge, we find that in the year of our Lord 1794, he was regularly initiated into the mysteries of freemasonry in this lodge; that he was passed and raised to the sublime degree of a Master Mason; and that he now is, and for about thirty-two years last past, has been a member in regular and good standing in this lodge: That from public documents, duly attested, and certified by civil authority, which we have seen, we are fully in the opinion that there has been, in the state of Connecticut, one of the most wicked, cruel, and abominable conspiracies, *ecclesiastical and civil*, formed and executed against our Brother Rogers, which ever was formed against any man in any country; and that it is the imperative duty of every freemason, of every order and degree, to espouse his cause; and that his conduct and character in this town and county, where he has resided a part of the time, and has been well acquainted for about thirty four years last past, is, and uniformly has been, so far as we know and believe, good and exemplary, and we hereby recommend him as a worthy man, a worthy minister of the Gospel, and a worthy mason. Dated Ballston, February 21st, 1826.

BEMSLEE PETERS. *Master*,
WILLIAM SAUNDERS. *S. Warden*,
N. J. SEELY, *J. Warden*.

John Monro, Peter Roe, Isaac Johnson, Committee of Franklin Lodge, No. 37.

Voted *unanimously*, that the foregoing report be accepted by this Lodge, and that the secretary be directed to furnish Brother Rogers with a certified copy of the same.

Attest, JOHN MILLER, Jun. Secretary.

At a regular communication of St. John's Lodge, No. 90, in Greenfield, county of Saratoga, on the 29th day of Oct. 1825, they gave a certificate to the amount of what is contained in the foregoing report of Franklin Lodge, signed by the Master, Senior and Junior Wardens. Galway Lodge, in the county

of Saratoga, did the same on the 24th of November, 1825, and signed by the Master, Senior and Junior Wardens.—Many other lodges in the states of New-York, Massachusetts and Rhode-Island, have expressed their utter abhorrence and detestation of the ecclesiastical and civil (if they can be called *civil*,) proceedings against me in Connecticut, and their determination to espouse the cause of a worthy, persecuted and falling brother.

Montgomery Royal Arch Chapter, No. 4, in Stillwater, took up my case some year ago, and voted unanimously, that as I was a Companion in regular and good standing in that Chapter, they considered that any indignity offered to me as a mason, was an insult upon them.

My much beloved and much respected brethren of all orders and degrees in Freemasonry, please to accept my most sincere thanks for your kind interferance in my behalf, and suffer me to congratulate myself, to congratulate you, and to congratulate the whole world, that there is an institution so ancient, so honorable, so well founded, and so well calculated to soften the asperities of human life, to conciliate the affections, and to refine the manners of mankind. While in this small, dark world, we are by nature poor, and miserable, and blind, and naked, no beings more destitute, without clothing or the implements of defence, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, without God and without hope in the world. In thissituation the blessed Sun of Righteousness arises with healing in his wings. He proclaims glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good will towards men; and I heard a voice saying unto me, ask and ye shall have, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you: so that a way is now provided for our admission into the blessed society of saints in light. Though now, while in this world, we may be poor, and blind, and naked, yet if we are prepared in our hearts, if we divest ourselves of all self-righteousness, of all confidence in the flesh, or in our own accomplishments or abilities; we may seek for admittance into this heavenly kingdom, and by being led by this Sun of Righteousness, who is our Friend, and whom we shall soon find to be our Elder Brother and Redeemer, we may boldly knock at the door of

divine grace, and it shall be opened unto us ; we may seek the light of this heavenly kingdom and we shall find it, we may ask to have and receive part of the benefits of this kingdom, and we shall have them. But let it never be forgotten, that as the disciples were pricked in the heart when St. Peter first preached to them this kingdom, so we must all feel in our naked breasts that torture which should be a shield to our faith, a prick to our conscience, and which will be certain death if we resist or do despite to this spirit of grace ; this is sharper than a two edged sword, and must not be resisted : But we, my brethren, must be animated by the spirit of the living God, we must be led by Jesus Christ, our friend and brother, and in the presence of the all-seeing eye of God, and before the throne of divine grace, we must, upon our bended knees, pray for the guidance and direction of Him who is infinitely wise : then as we put our trust in God, our faith will be well founded, we may arise and follow Jesus Christ our leader, and fear no danger. We may meet with opposition from the darkness of the west ; the violence of the south may oppose us ; yet by putting our trust in God, and following the counsels and directions of his Son, that invaluable Friend of human kind, we may go all around, and round and round the world, and fear no danger ; we shall be taught to take the steps of the Gospel, we shall, upon the right angle and square of our work, upon our bended knee make our vows of obedience to the God of heaven ; we shall then be brought out of the darkness of nature into the most astonishing light of the Gospel. We shall then clearly see, that as the sun rules, governs and enlightens the day ; as the moon rules, governs and enlightens the night, so the Son of God rules, governs and enlightens his church. We shall then see the great light of God's holy word in all its beauty and richness, to rule and govern our faith ; we shall see that which will keep us within due bounds with all men, but especially with those who have obtained the like precious faith with ourselves. We shall see that which will square all our actions, by teaching us that noblest and best of all rules, to do to others as we would have them do to us in like circumstances ; we shall see the neces-

sity of using the Christian gavel of affection to knock off every turbulent passion, and every rough corner of the human heart.

We shall see the scythe of time cutting down all before it; we shall observe the hourglass and the twenty-four inch gage. This will teach us, that as ENTERED APPRENTICES in the work of our God, we must be shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace; we must be clothed with the badge of innocence: and if we thus stand, with our loins girt and our lamps burning; if we learn to have our conversation right, and to do as we should do, and to speak as we should speak; we may then by special favour obtain more light; we may then *pass on to be fellow labourers and fellow crafts* in the work of the Gospel, as workers together with me, says St. Paul. We shall then see that without faith it is impossible to please God: by our faith and sincere obedience we shall have hope to enjoy the eternal and all glorious Godhead for ever and ever; we shall have charity, the noblest and greatest of all Christian graces; by this we shall love God supremely, and our neighbour as ourselves.—We shall remember what we once were, and have compassion for our brethren; we shall love as brethren, be kind, be pitiful, be courteous: not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing; but contrarywise, blessing. So that in that temple which is founded upon the Rock of Ages —which stands upon wisdom, strength and beauty; we shall possess faith, hope and charity. In FAITH, we shall depend upon the mercy and direction of God through Christ; we shall, in the blessed HOPE of the Gospel, cheerfully meet the sythe of time; we shall lie down in the silent grave, that we may awake in the glorious morn of the resurrection. In CHARITY we shall love God and all his creatures; with the trowel of charity we shall smooth over all their words and all their actions; we shall be unwilling to think ill, unwilling to speak ill, unwilling to do ill, to any one; but we shall be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment, and there will be no divisions among us. O, blessed God! what a happy time will this be: and thus may we be raised *to the sublime degree of master builders* in the spiritual temple of our God. Conspiracies may be formed against us; ruffins may assault us and lay violent hands upon us; the world

may cast us out as rubbish; they may *heave us over* their pale of charity; we may wander about in goat skins and sheep skins, destitute, afflicted, tormented; we may be stoned and sawn asunder; the violence of our enemies may smite us to the ground; yet if we maintain our integrity, the vine, the myrtle and the cassia, shall grow from our grave. Though in the Patriarchal religion; O Lord and my God! the flesh may be rotten and cleave from the bone; yet, in the Jewish religion, there is marrow in the bone; and in the Christian religion, life and im mortality are brought to light: the strong grip of the Lion of the tribe of Judah, who is Jesus Christ himself, who is the resurrection and the life, will raise up our dead bodies and fashion them like unto his own most glorious body, according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself. As Jesus Christ, who is the resurrection and the life, and in whom alone there is peace and safety, is called in scripture, the righteous branch; as he declares of himself, that he is the true and living vine; as the dove returned to Noah's Ark with a green Olive branch in her mouth, in token that the flood was over, and that there was peace and safety on earth; so we, when called upon the melancholy task of depositing the dead bodies of our brethren in the grave, deposit with them green boughs, in token, and in the blessed hope of peace, safety and immortality to them. So that in the masonic order, founded upon the great, ETERNAL I AM, who said let there be light, and there was light; founded also upon the great light of God's word, if our hearts, like those of David and Jonathan, be knit together in pure love and sincere friendship; if our constancy be such that we can truly say with the holy Job; though he slay me yet will I trust in him, I will not depart mine integrity; though men should heave us over the walls of this world as useless members of society, as mere rubbish; though they should kill us, yet we trust, we have that within us, which can never die; our bodies shall be raised up in the last day, and our names shall be written on that chief white corner stone which the builders in this world did refuse—on which will be a new name written, which none can read, except those who have learnt.

But, my brethren, while we are in the world, we must use the world, and the things of the world, as not abusing them; *as we pass by*, we must commit to faithful men, those who have been tried and found *trusty*, worthy and well qualified; those useful ordinances and instructions, which God has given for the good of his people. We must all be fellow-laborers in the vineyard of our God; we must work and labor while it is called to-day, and be contented with our wages; or else, mark well what I say! *mark well!* We may loose our reward, just in the very moment when we expect to receive it; for there is a time coming, *when all impostors and deceivers* shall be detected and brought to light. It will then be, that not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; so that in the great work of charity, we must be always ready and willing to step a foot out of our way to help a brother, to bend a knee in prayer to God for him, to have a breast to feel for his woes and to keep his secrets, to lend him a hand to support him in all his righteous undertakings, or else to warn him of his danger and help him out of difficulty, and have an ear to hear his complaints. These are some of the great duties of human life, these are some of that most excellent workmanship, which even the Queen of Sheba might admire! and exclaim as she did when she saw them! and unless we will comply with them, this may be the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and we have loved darkness rather than light; that though we have been the children of light, yet we have not walked as such. Then, when the great and dreadful day shall come, when the high arch of Heaven shall be disclosed, when God himself shall speak in thunder from Mount Sinai, and the earth shall shake terribly; when the bush shall burn with fire, and the lightning shall flash from one side of Heaven to the other, and the thunder of God shall roll and roar, and the whole earth shall be summoned to stand before the Grand Council of Heaven; we not having *holiness to the Lord*, either engraven in our hearts, or written on our foreheads, the most excellent King will sit in judgment against us, the great High Priest of our profession will cast us out, and consign us to the lower vaults of the earth; and the Ho-

ly Ghost, the Grand Scribe of Heaven, will record that the will of God is done. But, on the other side, if we will give ourselves up to the guidance and direction of God's ever blessed spirit, which we should always pray for and seek for; if we will walk by the lights given to us; if we will bear in mind the jewels and badges of our order; if we will mind and regulate ourselves by the plum line, the square, the compass, the level, the gavil, the trowel, &c. Judah and Benjamin may assault us, venomous beasts may fall upon us, but they cannot hurt us; if we will walk by the important lights of our order, we may find an Encampment of Saints in light. The road may be long; the path may be hard and rugged; we may be beset by Jews, Turks and Infidels, yet if we fight manfully the Christian warfare, we shall come off conquerors, and more than conquerors. *our lights* never shall be extinguished; but in the peaceful encampment of Sir Knight Templars and Saints above, we shall drink new wine, in that precious cup, made without hands; we shall find the Rock of Ages, Him who is the hope of all the ends of the earth. In the blissful presence of God, we (*as we were at first brought out of darkness into astonishing light, and have seen many things,*) shall now see the four and twenty elders, consisting of twelve Patriarchs and twelve Apostles, all falling down and worshipping before the throne of God, and their lights shining forth forever and ever, as the stars in the firmament of Heaven. The subject of Masonry is vast as eternity, and extensive as the Divinity himself! and many important suggestions I have which cannot be laid before you at this time. Without pursuing the subject further at present, let us all be reminded of our high and mighty vocations, as Christians, and as Masons, wherewith we are called! O, how careful ought we all to be, to adorn in all things the doctrine of God our Saviour; to knock off every turbulent passion, and every rough corner of our hearts; to curb every unholy desire, every licentious thought, and to square all our thoughts, words and actions, by the great light of God's word, which, as Masons and as Christians, should ever be open before us. O, let us remember at all times, and in all places, our jewels, our badges, our obligations, and encourage in all our hearts

and lives, all the workings of that divine sympathy, which gives to humanity so many charms. What can produce more real, substantial bliss, than the influence of that charity which as Christians and as Masons we are bound to encourage; a consciousness of soothing the disconsolate, befriending the destitute, assisting the fatherless and the widows, relieving oppressed virtue from contempt, disburdening the overcharged heart of its sorrows, wiping, with a lenient hand, the cold sweat from the brow of affliction in every species of human distress—blessed God! what a noble employment! happy, yea, thrice happy are you who know by experience that a series of generous actions is a source of the most sublime happiness and satisfaction that can be felt on this side of Heaven! Yes, the blessings of those who are ready to perish, shall forever rest upon your heads; and their daily wishes and prayers in your behalf, shall ascend, like a fragrant column of incense before the throne of God, and meet with an honorable acceptance with him. And is masonry a fraternity to encourage, to promote and to heighten every social grace and every Christian virtue? is it a society to draw nearer, and still nearer the cords of affection? is it an institution calculated to befriend the poor, to espouse the cause of injured innocence, to repel the shafts of slander, reinstate the insulted dignity, to receive into the arms of love and affection every worthy, persecuted, injured brother, and to relieve the wants of the needy! Hail it! O, hail it, blessed of the Lord. I congratulate myself, I congratulate you, I congratulate the whole world on the establishment of a society, next to the religion of Heaven, the most ancient, the most honorable, the most useful, the most loving, and by those who are most acquainted with it, the most blessed among the children of men.

But while we are thus congratulating ourselves, let us remember that it is appointed unto all men, once to die. Our fathers and the prophets, where are they? Let us ever remember and pay the tribute of respect to the virtues of our departed brethren who have gone before us. Where is Washington, Warren, and Montgomery? those ever respected friends and patrons of our order! And O, how many dear

brethren, whose charming company graced our social circles, have departed this life, since I first had the honor of being a Mason? My Lord and my God! do their lights shine no longer among us? is their glass out? has the scythe of time cut them down? has the level evened them with the ground? and is there no brother's widow, or orphan children, looking to us for consolation, to whom we can extend the hand of charity and friendship? into whose bleeding wounds we can pour the wine and oil of comfort, while we forget not the corn of relief? Remember that we ourselves also must soon die; the scythe will cut us down, the level will even us with the ground, and we must leave our families and friends to those who, under God, shall come after us; we shall be taken from our beloved fraternity, and from society. How solemn! how awful! how interesting is the event to which I turn your attention! Does it remind us that there is neither age nor station that can free us from the unwelcome approach of death? Die we all must; it is the last debt of nature. Let us then all be prepared for that which we know to be so inevitably certain. May we ever be mindful of the All-seeing Eye of God. May we keep our hands clean and our hearts pure. May the jewels and badges of our order never be tarnished. And may we, being washed in the blood of the Lamb, be presented pure and spotless before the throne of God.—Amen. *So mote it be.*

CHAPTER XVII.

ON RELIGION.

If people would be careful to understand and define the terms which they use in conveying their ideas to each other, on subjects of religion, it would greatly abate, if not entirely do away those unhappy differences and disputes which now exist in the world. Religion is derived from the Latin word *religo*, which signifies to bind, and is that bond or obligation which every creature owes to its Creator: So that every

person who believes that there is a God, and endeavors *to* live a life accordingly, may be said to be a religious person; and his religion will be either true or false, according as his ideas of God are correct or incorrect, for a false religion is a departure from true religion. ENTHUSIASM according to our present definition of the term, is religious zeal and exercise carried beyond the bounds of sober reason and sound judgment. No one ever acts wisely either in religion or in any thing else, except when he acts reasonably; and the moment we suffer our feelings to run away with our judgment, either in religion or politics, in astronomy or philosophy, in drinking or courtship, or in any thing else, we are very liable to go astray from duty. SUPERSTITION is derived from the Latin words *super* and *sto*, which signify to stand upon: and it is making that a matter of great importance in our minds, which is in itself of no material consequence. It is being very strenuous and consciencious in some circumstantials of religion, while the great duties of human life are but little regarded. BIGOTRY, is adhering to any principle without examination, without reason, and contrary to our judgment. A man may be firm in his opinion, but the moment he shuts up his mind against reason, that moment he becomes a bigot. CONVERSION, is derived from the Latin words *con* and *verto*, which signify turning from, and is expressed in the 18th chapter of Ezekial, viz. "when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." And our Saviour says to Peter—Satan desires to have thee, and to sift thee as wheat, but when *thou art converted*, i. e. when thou hast turned away from this temptation, strengthen the brethren. REGENERATION, is derived from the Latin words *re* and *genero*, which signify to be born again; and our Saviour says it must be of water and of the spirit: which the Christian church, in all nations, ages and countries, has defined to be water in baptism, whereby the person is born out of the society of this world, into which he is born at his natural birth; into the society of Christians; and the spirit which is given in God's good time, whereby the natural disposition is changed from the love and practice of that which

is wrong, to the love and practice of that which is good and right : and that every man, woman and child, who is capable of being saved, is capable of being born again, and ought to be baptized : and as we are all children of the same infinitely compassionate parent of the universe, each one has an equal right to all the means of grace, and final salvation : and that it is wrong to refuse infant children the benefits and privileges of the Gospel covenant because their parents are not so good and exemplary as they should be.

The Christian church has always divided the Christian year into two parts, viz. from Advent to Trinity Sunday, and from Trinity Sunday to Advent again. During the first six months, we are taught what God has done for us, and how much our salvation has been the care of Heaven : During the last six months we are taught what God requires us to do for ourselves. ADVENT, is derived from the Latin words *ad* and *venio*, which signify coming or advancing to any place ; but as the word is used in the Christian church, it means our Saviour's coming into this world, and is always the four weeks next before Christmas. During these four weeks it is the indispensable duty of every minister to preach and explain to his hearers the necessity and benefit of Christ's coming into the world to redeem mankind, and the importance of his coming again in the last day to judge the world. CHRISTMAS, is the day of our Saviour's nativity ; on which the Christian church joins with the Heavenly Hosts, in giving glory to God in the highest, that in and through Him, who is born into the world, as on that day, there may be peace on earth, and God's good will to the sinful children of men. After Christmas the church follows our Saviour through the whole course of his life, so that there is no doctrine he ever taught, no miracle he ever wrought, no example that he ever set forth for our imitation, which will not be duly explained, inculcated, and enjoined, and by every minister in all nations, countries, and languages, at the same time. Our religion is not as the world was before it was made, viz. *without form*, and void, and darkness upon it, but it is reduced to a regular system, so that there is no article of the Christian faith, necessary to be believed, and no duty necessary to be performed, which will not be regular-

ly and duly pointed out, explained, and enjoined, at least once in every year, and by every minister at the same time. Most of the Old Testament is appointed to be read through once, and the New Testament twice every year, and the Book of Psalms once every month, and by every minister at the same time; and it is so arranged that the chapters and portions of scripture which the ministers are required to read will explain and enjoin the articles of faith necessary to be believed, and the duties necessary to be performed on that day, and at all times. NEW-YEAR. is observed, not because it is the first day of the year, but because it was the day on which our Saviour was circumcised. On that day it is especially the duty of every minister to lay before his hearers the necessity and the advantage of being admitted into covenant with God; in the Jewish church by the rite of circumcision, and the Christian church by the sacrament of Baptism. Our commission is to preach the gospel to every creature. This gospel is good news to all mankind; it is that notwithstanding, since the fall, they are conceived in sin, and are by nature the children of wrath, i. e. opposed to God, God is now willing, in and through Jesus Christ, to receive them into the arms of his mercy, to forgive their sins, to sanctify them with the Holy Ghost, to give them the kingdom of heaven, and everlasting life, and a glorious resurrection at the last day: and these promises are offered to you, to your children, and to all that are far off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call; and he says, look unto me all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved. Those who have these good news, and are willing to receive these great and glorious promises, are required to accept them by coming into covenant with God, by promising and engaging on their part, that they will use their best endeavours to renounce and avoid all kind of sin and wickedness, that they will constantly believe God's holy word, and obediently keep his commandments. The sign and seal of this covenant is water applied by lawful authority, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: for there are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, (i. e. the Son, for he was made flesh, and dwelt among men,) and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One. And

there are three that bear witness in earth ; the Spirit and the water, and the blood,—represented by the blood and water that sprinkled upon the earth from the side of our Saviour as he hung upon the cross ; blood to show that an atonement was made for sin ; water to shew the purifying nature of the gospel ; and the spirit to change the heart or affections of mankind from the love and practice of ungodliness and worldly lusts, to the love of God, and of a sober, righteous and godly life, and these three agree in one. For this reason infant children and others are sprinkled in baptism, to signify the outpourings of the Holy Ghost, the blood and water that sprinkled from the side of our Saviour as he hung upon the cross, and that we are planted in the likeness, not of his burial, but *of his death.* But the frailty of human nature is such, that we ought often to call ourselves to an account, to bring our consciences to the bar of God, to become feelingly sensible of our sins and unworthiness, to become convicted of our sins, and to flee to the blood of Christ in the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ; there to receive all the benefits of his body broken and his blood shed for us, that we may obtain the forgiveness of what is past, renew the covenant between God and our souls, and be reinstated into the divine favour and protection. See John vi. 53—54. EPIPHANY, is derived from the Greek word *epiphainomai*, and signifies appearance. It is the time when our Savoiur was manifested to the Gentiles by the leading of a miraculous star : when the partition wall between Jews and Gentiles was broken down, and free salvation was offered to every son and daughter of the human race upon equal terms. At this time we consider the sheet which St. Peter saw let down from Heaven, containing four footed beasts of every kind, to represent all the different nations upon earth. At this time we consider the first miracle our Saviour wrought, which was that of turning water into wine. We also consider a visible manifestation of the persons in the ever-adorable Trinity of Heaven at the baptism of our Saviour, which was his ordination, or consecration to the office of a PRIEST, for he then began to be about thirty years of age. God the Father was manifested in the voice from heaven, which said, This is my beloved Son,

hear ye him. The Son was manifested in the water of baptism, and the Holy Ghost was manifested in the form of a dove descending and lighting upon him; and this is one reason why we are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. ASHWEDNESDAY, is the first of the forty days and forty nights that our Saviour fasted and did penance for the sins of mankind, and is the first day of *Lent*, which is an old Saxon word signifying spring, and includes the time of our Saviour's fasting, which was in the spring of the year. PALM SUNDAY, is the day that our Saviour ascended into Jerusalem the last time amidst the hosannahs of thousands, and those who went before and followed after, cut down branches from the trees, and strewed them in the way, &c. in fulfilment of the prophecy of Zachariah, ix. 9. written about 587 years before. PASSION WEEK, is the week after Palm Sunday, and is the week of our Saviour's cruel and unfair trial before the Jewish court or council. GOOD FRIDAY, is the day on which our blessed Saviour died upon the cross for our redemption and final salvation. EASTERDAY, is the day that our Saviour arose from the dead as an earnest and as a pledge of the future resurrection of all his faithful followers, to immortal glory and happiness. Easter is derived from an old Saxon *oest* which signifies to rise, and *star*, a luminary in heaven. So that as the lightning shines from the east even unto the west, so shall be the coming of the Son of Man: and for this reason do all nations bury their dead with their heads to the west facing the east, so that when Christ shall come to judge the world in the last day, and all who are in their graves shall hear his voice, come forth, their faces will be towards him, to receive the joyful blessing which he shall then pronounce upon them, saying, Come ye blessed of my Father, &c. Easter is the same to us that the Passover was to the Jews: As they calculated their time by the moon, so we are obliged to have recourse to the same method of keeping time, for the Almighty has said, Exodus xii. 14. Ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations: *ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever.* And St. Paul says, 1 Cor. v. 7. Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast. HOLY THURS-

DAY, is what we call Ascension day; and is the day when our Saviour ascended visibly into heaven, Acts i. 9, 10. and is set down at the right hand of God, to intercede for us, till he shall come again with power and great glory: WHITSUNDAY, is the day when the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles in the form of fire; and they were baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire; as was foretold by John the Baptist. It is the same to us that *Pentecost* was to the Jews. TRINITY SUNDAY, is a day set part to inculcate the great and mysterious doctrine of the holy and ever-adorable Trinity, in whose name we have been baptized. That there are three persons and one God, is a doctrine taught in the holy scriptures. In the first chapter of Genesis, God the Father spake; the Word, (which was afterwards made flesh.) went forth, and the Spirit moved upon the face of the waters. In the 26th verse, the Almighty says, *in the plural number*, let us make man in our image, and after our likeness. Our UNDERSTANDING creates every thing to us that we know, it is the Creator within us, and is to us, the father of all our other faculties. Our MEMORY is begotten by the understanding, proceeds from the understanding, saves and preserves what the understanding creates, and is the saviour within us. What the understanding creates and the memory preserves, OUR AFFECTION will induce us to love it or hate it: to pursue it or avoid it, and will call us into action. Tell me how much older the understanding is than the memory, and I will tell you how much older the Father is than the Son. But this doctrine is not only taught in the holy scriptures and illustrated by the *Understanding*, the *Memory*, and the *Affection*, but in the very formation of our bodies, which are first covered by an *epidermis*, i. e. scaf skin, the *rete mucosum* i. e. a substance under the scaf skin, and the *cutis vera*, i. e. the real skin. Allowing thirty days to a month, in nine months are 270 days; so allowing the nails to be bones, (they are not bone, but are nearer bone than cartilege, but call them bones,) there are 270 bones in each human body, viz. just as many bones in the human body as there are days in nine months. There are fifty-two weeks in the year, and fifty-two bones in the trunk of the human body.—There are twelve months in the year, and twelve dorsal ver-

tibræ or joints in the back. There are seven days in the week, and seven joints in the neck to bow down to labour with. There are twenty four hours in the day, and twenty-four ribs in the human body. There are thirty-two different kinds of alimentary food, more or less, and just thirty two teeth in every human mouth, when they have a full set to masticate that food. There are eight notes of music, and just eight parts in each ear to hear those notes of music. There are but seven primary colours, and just seven parts in each eye to see those colours. *There are* 3 *lobes* in the brain, which is the seat of life, called the cerebrum, cerebellum, and medula oblongata, and there are *three persons in the Holy Trinity* who give life. There are thirty-nine books in the Old Testament, thirty nine stripes were to be inflicted on those who should violate those books, and just thirty-nine pair of nerves to feel those stripes when they were inflicted. There are five senses, viz. hearing, seeing, tasting, smelling, and feeling,; there are five orders of architecture, five points of moral fellowship, and five fingers, and five toes on each hand and foot to perform them with. How wonderfully is the human body made, and how exactly is it formed to answer the purpose for which it was designed! and to deny the doctrine of the Trinity, is to deny your baptism, is to deny the holy scriptures, is to deny your own souls, is to deny your own bodies, and is to deny the truth of the opinion of the whole Christian church.

Episcopalians are so called from the Greek word Episkopos, which signifies a bishop or an overseer, who is supposed to be the chief governor or overseer of that part of Christ's church, where he may be located. Moses, in the Old Testament, was a type or representative of Christ in the New Testament. And the Jewish church was, in all material points, a shadow or representation of the Christian church: 1st, Moses was born into this world for the important purpose of redeeming and rescuing the children of Israel from the bondage of Pharoah and the Egyptians, and conducting them through the wilderness to the land of Canaan. In answer, 1570 years afterwards, Jesus Christ was born into this world for the important porpose of redeeming and rescuing man-

kind from the bondage of Satan and our spiritual enemies, and conducting them through the wilderness of this world to the land of everlasting life and happiness, which is the heavenly Canaan 2d, Moses was preserved in Egypt when Pharoah commanded all the male infant children of Israel to be put to death lest he should lose his kingeom. In answer, 1570 years afterwards, Joseph and Mary, being warned in a dream, fled into Egypt, and Jesus Christ was preserved in the same place, when Herod commanded all the infant male children of Israel, that were two years old and under, to be put to death, lest he should lose his kingdom. 3d, Moses was obliged to work miracles, and to show signs and wonders to persuade the children of Israel to believe in him and to follow him. In answer, Jesus Christ was obliged to work miracles and to shew signs and wonders to persuade mankind to believe in him and to follow him. 4th, Moses led the children of Israel through the waters of the Red Sea, and they were baptized unto him, and in the cloud before they could be secure from the power of Pharoah and his hosts. In answer, Jesus Christ leads mankind through the waters of Baptism, and they are baptized unto him and the Holy Ghost, before they can be secure from the power of Satan and his hosts. 5th, Moses went up into the mountain and fasted forty days and forty nights before he delivered his ten commandments. In answer, Jesus Christ went up into a mountain and fasted forty days and forty nights before he delivered his beatitudes, which are his commandments, in the 5th chapter of Matthew. 6th, Moses and the glory of God were manifested to the children of Israel in the form of fire in a burning bush, when they could not look upon him for the brightness of his face. In answer, Jesus Christ and the glory of God were manifested to his disciples in his transfiguration on the mount, when his face became like fire, above the brightness of the sun: and his raiment became shining white so as no fuller on earth could white them. 7th, The children of Israel would have famished in the wilderness with thirst, had it not been for water which Moses caused to flow from a rock. In answer, mankind would famish in the wilderness of this world with thirst after spiritual and immortal things,

were it not for the doctrines of life and salvation which Jesus Christ causes to flow from his Gospel. 8th, The children of Israel could not be supported in their natural life till they could arrive to the land of promise, without manna, which was a peculiar bread sent down from Heaven. In answer to this, we cannot be supported in our spiritual life, and nourished unto eternal life in the world to come, without the sacrament of the Lord's supper. Jesus Christ says, I am the bread that came down from Heaven. This is my body, and this is my blood. 9th, The children of Israel could not take possession of the land of promise until they passed the river of Jordan, and the walls of Jericho fell with the blowing of ram's horns, the sound of trumpets, a shout and a great noise. In answer, we cannot take possession of our land of promise, of everlasting life and happiness, until we pass the Jordan of death: and the walls of our Jericho, which are our natural bodies, fall to the ground with the sighs, groans and convulsive agonies of death. 10th, There were twelve Patriarchs in the Old Testament. In answer, Jesus Christ chose twelve apostles in the New Testament. 11th, As Moses chose seventy Elders to assist him in the government of the Jewish church. In answer, Jesus Christ chose seventy disciples to assist him in the government of the Christian church. 12th, As Moses appointed three separate and distinct orders of clergy, viz. High Priests, Priests, and Levites, in the Jewish church, to continue to the end of that dispensation. In answer, Jesus Christ appointed three separate and distinct orders of clergy, viz. Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in the Christian church, to continue to the end of the world. 13th, As the Priesthood in the Jewish church was transmitted in a direct, uninterrupted line of succession from Aaron to Christ. In answer, the Priesthood in the Christian church has and will be transmitted in a direct uninterrupted line of succession from Christ's ascension into Heaven, till his second coming to judge the world in the last day. 14th, As the Jewish church was taken captive, carried into Babylon, and kept 70 years in slavery. In answer, the church of England, the Episcopal church in Germany, and elsewhere, have been taken captive by the Roman Catholics, carried into Babylonish

and Popish darkness, and kept for many years in slavery. 15th, As the Jewish church was preserved and restored to its former glory. In answer, the Episcopal church was preserved through the dark ages of Popery; and at the reformation restored to its former glory. 16th, As Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, rose up against the established Priesthood in the Jewish church, under a vain pretence that all the congregation were holy and pure, as is contained in the 16th chapter of Numbers. In answer, Oliver Cromwell, and his 250 Puritan members of parliament, more or less, *who were princes in the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown*, rose up against the established Priesthood in the Christian church under the same vain pretence that they were more holy and pure, *and hence they were called Puritans*. 17th, As the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up alive, and all that appertained to them. In answer, Oliver Cromwell, and his associates, died a miserable death; his 250 members of parliament came to nothing; the ground, in one sense, opened her mouth and swallowed them up alive, and all that appertained to them. Fire came out from the Lord and consumed one party. The fire of enthusiasm and delusion consumed these, and still continues to consume the sectaries who follow their example.

From the building of the tower of Babel, what doctrine, reproof, correction and instruction, are we to gain? It happened for our example: They, not contented with the way of salvation prescribed by the Almighty, undertook to build a tower of their own, and to climb up to Heaven in their own way; but their tongues were divided, they were scattered, and where are they? In answer, people now, not contented with the way of life and salvation, as prescribed by the Almighty in the Episcopal church, which is established by divine wisdom, in conformity to the pattern under the Jewish dispensation, have separated from this ancient and universal church, are building to themselves towers of Babel; their tongues are divided, there are no two of them that have the same prayer, the same psalm, the same portions of scripture, the same worship at the same time; and if you could hear them all at once, there is nothing below the heavenly world

that would resemble the builders of the tower of Babel so much as they would. And where are they? Scattered upon the face of the earth, and their tongues are still divided. But in the ancient Episcopal and universal church, are their tongues divided? No: this is like a city at unity in itself; *the King's daughter* (that is, the true church) *is all glorious within*, see the 45th psalm; they all speak the same things at the same time; they all have the same prayers, for God is always the same, and the general wants of mankind are always the same; they all have the same psalms; they all have the same portions of scripture; they all have the same worship at the same time; and if you could hear them all at once, like a column of incense, their united devotions would ascend to heaven; and God, who is a God of order, and not of confusion, would grant them a favorable acceptance; this is the holy Catholic church; the general assembly in earth and in heaven, and the church of the first-born.

I mean not to insult, nor to offend any one, but in the bowels of mercy and kindness, I beseech each one for himself to stop, pause, think and consider what I have said on the case of Moses and Christ, on the Jewish church and Christian church, on Korah and his company, and Oliver Cromwell and his company, on the tower of Babel, and the separation from the Episcopal church. I ask your consciences: I ask you in the love and fear of God, are these things so? I might mention the case of Nadab and Abihu, who burnt incense *with strange fire*, and the fire came out from the Lord and consumed them. I might mention the case of Micah, of Jeroboam, of Saul, and others. The children of Israel, in passing through the wilderness to the land of promise, were designed to represent us in passing through the wilderness of this world to the land of everlasting life and happiness, and what happened to them was for our *instruction and admonition*.

The common apology is, that our forefathers separated from the church of England, and they separated from the church of Rome; and that we had as much right to separate as they had. But this is not the truth. Taking it for granted, that the sentiments contained in my letter to Governor Wolcott, [page 166] are correct, viz. that no one can lawful-

ly act in the name of another without his authority; I proceed to remark that our Saviour Jesus Christ was like Moses, a lawgiver, and expressly declared that he had all power in heaven and in earth. This he proved by the four great evidences of the truth of Christianity, viz. 1st, MIRACLES; 2d, FULFILMENT OF PROPHECIES; 3d, HISTORICAL FACTS; 4th, INTERNAL MARKS OF TRUTH. With this authority he commissioned his apostles to go into all the world, to preach the Gospel, that is, the good news of life and salvation, to every creature, to baptize all nations; and promised to continue with them always, even unto the end of the world; and that the gates of hell should never prevail against them. With this commission they went forth into different parts of the world, among the different nations of the earth, under different forms of civil government, where they spoke different languages, and among them planted the Christian religion and the Christian church, in exact conformity to the Jewish religion and church in the Old Testament; only that one was a representation of the other, as Moses himself was to represent Christ. The apostles and their successors were soon called BISHOPS, and were in answer to the High Priests in the Jewish church. The Elders were soon called *Priests*, and were in answer to the Priests in the Jewish church, and the deacons were ordained *Ministers*, and were in answer to the Levites.

Heylyn, in his Cosmography, which is a book that I never have heard doubted, and is as much to be relied on as any other book of human composition, says, in the 3d page, Folio:—

"I have taken more especial notice of the ancient and present face of Christianity in all parts of the world: the planting and government of the churches, the heterodoxies and opinions of the several sects into which it doth now stand dismembered; by which it will appear most clearly, among other things, that the doctrine and government of the church are of equal standing; that this government was no other than that of *Bishops*, and that wherever Christianity did find any admittance, *Episcopacy* was also admitted as a part thereof. The Gospel being in most places first preached by Bishops or growing to esteem and strength under their authority.

And it is found, upon these researches, that *Episcopacy* is coeval with the church itself."

These are the words of one of the most learned and pious men in the world: a man whose truth I never have heard called in question. St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, where he was crucified, with his head downward, by the cruel edict of Nero, A. D. 69. St. James was the first Bishop in Jerusalem, and finally sealed the truth of his religion by being beheaded there under the order of Herod. St. Andrew was the first Bishop in Greece, where he was finally crucified under the edict of Ægeas: his cross was not in common form, viz. a post set in the ground and a beam or stick across the top of it, with the hands nailed to each end of the stick, and the feet crossed and nailed to the post; but his cross was in the form of an X, with one hand nailed to the top on each side, and his feet extended and nailed to each post below; and for this reason an X has always been called St. Andrew's cross. It might be useful and entertaining to give an account of the life, labors, settlement and death of each of the Apostles, who were the first Bishops of the church —but this cannot be done without going beyond my limits, which I have far exceeded already. St. John was the first Bishop in Asia: St. Mark and St. Luke went into Africa: St. Thomas went into the East Indies, and on his way planted a church in Syria, which has remained there from that day to this, not knowing that there were any other people in the world, who professed Christianity but themselves; and no other people knew of them. They were discovered a few years since by the Rev. Claudias Buchanan, who was an Episcopal Missionary; and to his unspeakable joy, he found that in all material points of Government or authority, of Doctrine and of Worship, they agreed with the church of England. This is one of the most extraordinary and interesting discoveries which have been made within 500 years. It is a plain and undeniable evidence of the truth of the Episcopal church. In consequence of it, one of the most learned and distinguished characters in the State of New-York has declared in favor of the Episcopal church, and says, if he had no other proof than this Syrian church, it would satisfy his mind. St.

Paul was the first Bishop in England. Mason and Lindsay say, that he came there, A. D. 59. The general account and opinion is, that he first preached the Gospel in a place then called Avingnon, and which is now called Glastenbury. He continued his ministry in England and in different parts of Europe and in Asia, for 35 years, when he returned to Rome and was beheaded there, by a cruel edict of the bloody Nero, in the 68th year of his age.

The church of England being thus founded and established, not by St. Peter, but by St. Paul, continued in union and prosperity with the other churches. Her Bishops attended their meetings and councils. The church of Rome was at this time as pure a church as any other. At this time there was no such thing as Popery; the bishop of Rome claimed no superiority, he exercised no superiority. *But in the year* 606, *Phocas invested the bishop of Rome with civil authority, and then he was not only Bishop, but Emperor of the whole Roman Empire.* In 606, he sent St. Austin into England, and demanded that the bishop of England should submit to the bishop of Rome, as the head of the Universal Church, as Bishop over all other Bishops; AND IT WAS THIS WHICH BEGAN POPERY. The bishop of England declared, *that he never so much as heard* that the bishop of Rome ever pretended to have any authority in England before; and wholly refused to submit. St. Austin returned to Rome, and two years after, viz. 609, he came over the second time, and then engaged Ethelbert, King of the Saxons, to wage war with the ancient Britons, and to compel them by force and arms to submit; some fled to Wales, and some to one place, and some to another. At length they agreed to acknowledge the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, and to pay what was called *the Peter pence;* but still they retained their own Bishops and Clergy, taught their own doctrine, and performed their own service; but as the superiority of the bishop of Rome was now acknowledged, their innovations and corruptions would, and did prevail in England; still there appears to have been, on the part of the ancient Britons, a constant opposition to the bishop of Rome, and to his pretensions. Frequently one, and then another would dare to lift his voice, but were soon

put down ; till at length Henry the 8th, King of England, became disgusted with the pretensions of the Bishop of Rome, and protected bishops Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, three of the best Bishops, and most worthy men, in the kingdom, in rejecting the authority of the bishop of Rome, *and in reducing the church of England to what it was before he had any authority in England, and before there was any such thing as Popery in the world.* This is what is meant by the REFORMATION, and now we are told that our forefathers had as much right to separate from the church of England as they had to separate from the church of Rome! What a vain pretence! The church of England was of divine origin, it was of divine authority, established by St. Paul; handed down by a direct, uninterrupted line of succession, even through the dark ages of Popery, as the Jewish church was through the dark ages of Babylonish captivity ; that church *was restored* to its former glory ; this church *is restored* to its former glory, and yet our forefathers would, and did separate ; but on what grounds? Was it because they had no authority? No, certainly not, for if the church of England nothing, and they came from nothing ; then they must be nothing, *ex nihilo nihil fit.* Was it because their doctrine was either dishonorable to God, or hurtful to man, or contrary to the scriptures ? Nothing of this can be made to appear. Was it because the worship was not founded upon the authority of God's word, because it did not breathe the spirit of the gospel, because it was not in unison with the rest of the Christian world ? Nothing of all this is claimed, is even pretended. But the pretence of separation was that they were more holy and more pure than other folks, and hence they were called *Puritans ;* but their purity did not consist in holding the faith in the unity of the spirit, or in the bond of peace, or in more righteousness of life than other folks. So soon as they got the upper hand, they murdered Charles the first, who, in many respects, was one of the best Kings that ever sat on the throne of England. Oliver Cromwell was proclaimed Lord Protector. The Bishops and clergy were all banished out of the kingdom ; Charles the second fled to France and elsewhere, a law was made, inflicting fine, impris-

onment, and even confiscation on any one who should be detected in using the book of Common Prayer, in any church or chapel, private house or family. The kingdom was thrown into confusion, and civil war, the most dreadful of all wars, ensued. At length Charles the 2d *was restored*, the Bishops and clergy were recalled, the Puritans fled to America and elsewhere, and peace was restored. Goff and Dixwell, *two of the pretended Judges* of Charles the 1st, lived, and were supported and protected in a cave just west of New-Haven, and within a few miles of where I was born.

Blackstone, in his commentaries, 4th vol. page 104, says, "that the ancient British church, by whomsoever it was planted, *was a stranger to the Bishop of Rome, and to all his pretended authority.*" And in page 103d, speaking of the Puritan zeal, says, "the dreadful effects of such a religious bigotry, when actuated by erroneous principles, even of the protestant kind, are sufficiently evident from the history of the Anabaptists in Germany, the Covenanters in Scotland, and that deluge of sectaries in England, *who murdered their sovereign, overturned the church and Monarchy, shook every pillar of law, justice and private property, and most devoutly established a kingdom of* SAINTS *in their stead*" The very same spirit dictated the *blue laws of Connecticut ;* murdered the Quakers in Salem, in Massachusetts ; fastened Roger Williams and his friends to the tail-ends of ox carts, and whipped them and the Baptists out of Boston. The same disposition fined and imprisoned the Rev. Mr. White, in Windham, in Connecticut ; silenced the Rev. Mr. Robbins of Branford, for more than 20 years, without hearing or trial, divided and broke up their own church in Wallingford ; persecuted me for almost 20 years, and finally on the charge of crimes said to have been committed in Griswold, when I was not within 100 miles of the place, and by suppressing my testimony, refusing to send for witnesses, overruling the law of evidence, admitting a perjured person and a lying, theivish negro to testify, I was actually condemned and imprisoned for two whole years, and deprived of almost every thing which could make life desirable.

When our forefathers were about separating from the

church of England, various means were used to prevent if possible, so great a calamity and so much mischief as would in all probability result from it. With this view the 39 articles of religion were composed and adopted; calculated with a designed latitude to embrace, if possible, the dissenters on one side, and to guard the church against popery on the other. For 1600 years the Episcopal church of England had existed without any other articles of religion than the holy scriptures, the creeds and the different offices of the church: but now, articles of religion seemed necessary for the before mentioned purposes.

THERE WERE FIVE POINTS OF DOCTRINE, in which they then did, and do now, materially differ from the church of England.

1st, Our forefathers held, at that time, and many hold at the present day, that God Almighty had from all eternity elected one part of mankind to everlasting life and happiness in the other world, without any regard to their conduct in this; and that he had in the same manner passed by and foreordained all the rest to everlasting death and misery. In the Confession of Faith, as revised and agreed upon in Philadelphia, 1821, are these words, viz. "By the decree of God for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, *and others are foreordained to everlasting death;* and these men and angels thus predestinated and foreordained are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished; and all of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any thing else in the creature as conditions or causes moving him thereunto." In answer, the Episcopal church has always held and taught, that God Almighty has determined, from all eternity, to bestow everlasting life and happiness after death, upon all those in every nation, country, language and persuasion, under Heaven, who, in this life, shall live in obedience to his holy laws and die in that faith; and that he never will inflict everlasting death upon any, except those who live in sin and die without repentance.

2d, They held that Jesus Christ never died for more than one part of mankind, and that he never redeemed any but the elect only. In answer, the Episcopal church hold that Jesus Christ has tasted death for every one: that he made a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. In the communion service we say, "that Jesus Christ, who made there, by his one oblation of himself, once offered, a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world;" and that every son and daughter of the human race, is now put into such a situation that they may obtain eternal life and happiness in the other world, if they will only use the means which God has in great mercy provided for them, in and through the death and sufferings of his own Son in this world.

3d, They hold that mankind are now, notwithstanding all that Christ has done and suffered for them, totally depraved; that thay are wholly inclined to all kind of evil, and entirely disabled to all kind of good; that they are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and *wholly inclined to all evil.* In answer, the Episcopal church holds that since Jesus Christ is the light which lighteth *every man that cometh into the world;* since the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal, no son nor daughter of the human race is now so depraved but that he may comply with the overtures of Divine mercy—and may be saved; even infant children have their original sin washed away by the blood of Christ, and never having committed any actual transgression, may be saved. We hold that Divine grace is in proportion to Divine requirement; that if God invites all men to be saved, and requires all men to be saved: he puts it into the power of all men to be saved, and if all men are not saved, this will be their condemnation, that light has come into the world and they have loved darkness when they might and ought to have done otherwise. Every man shall be judged according to that he hath done, considering the light and knowledge that he had or might have had, for there is no respect of persons with God. They that have the law of God or nature shall be judged according to the law of God or nature, and they that

have the law of the Gospel shall be judged according to the law of the Gospel: for to whom much is given from them shall much be required. If mankind are, as some people pretend, so totally depraved, that they cannot accept the offers of grace and salvation, they most certainly, are none the better for those offers. But the Arminian principle on the other hand, that mankind are not naturally more inclined to evil than they are to good; and that therefore conversion and regeneration are not necessary, is contradicted by scripture and by our own daily observation. And it is a scandal upon the Episcopal church to say, that because they are not Calvinists they are Arminians. The Episcopal church says expressly in her form of baptism. "Forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and our Saviour Christ saith, none can enter into the kingdom of God, *except he be regenerate and born anew of water and the Holy Ghost.*" *This is under the Gospel.* In our General Confession we constantly acknowledge that we have followed too much the devices and desires *of our own hearts*, that there is no health in us. And in the Collect for the second Sunday in Lent: Almighty God, who seest that we have no power of ourselves, to help ourselves, keep us, both outwardly in our bodies, and inwardly in our souls, &c. But because we have no power of ourselves, it is not to say, that divine grace is not given to us and that it is not sufficient for us.

4th, They held that the true and saving grace of God was never given to, nor designed for, more than one part of mankind; and that to them it was without any foresight of faith obedience or good works, or any thing else on the part of the creature; and that was absolutely irresistible in their conversion and final salvation. In answer, we hold, with Saint Paul, that *the grace of God*, that very grace which bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto *all men*, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world. But that this grace is given in such a manner that it may be resisted, and on that account the Apostle advises us not to resist the Spirit, not to do despite to the Spirit of grace, not to grieve nor quench the Spirit, by living in sin and hardening our hearts against

the overtures of divine mercy. We hold that the grace of God which bringhth salvation is as extensive and as universal as the offers and calls of salvation; and that if people perish, it must be for not being saved, when they might have been saved.else why can they be justly blamed for not being saved?

5th, They held that if any person ever had one spark of this true and saving grace, they were sealed, from that moment, unto salvation, and they never could fall from it. That "God did from all eternity decree *to justify all the elect*," &c. and that "they *can never fall from a state of justification*." Is not this Antinomianism? God will justify the elect let them do what they will! what would be a sin in others would not be a sin in them! In answer, the Episcopal church hold with our Saviour, viz. that he that endureth to the end shall be saved; that it is one thing to have the grace of God, and another thing to persevere in the use of it, by bringing forth the fruits of it, in a virtuous, good life and conversation; and unless we do that, we forfeit our inheritance. These are the FIVE POINTS of doctrine which originally caused our forefathers to dissent, or separate from the church of England; and they are the points in which the Congregational Presbyterians in Connecticut now differ from the Episcopal church.

Another ground on which our forefathers separated from the Church of England was, that they disliked the use of the Book of Common Prayer. They held that the sacrifice of prayer, adoration, and thanksgiving, ought not to be prepared beforehand. Psalm tunes were not taught, and organs and other instruments of music were an abomination. I remember myself to have seen some pious people leave the meeting-house because the 148th psalm was sung to the tune of Lenox. But they can now have singing schools, learn the gayest tunes, use organs and other instruments of music:— Stanhole and Hopkins is laid aside: Tate and Braidy is laid aside: Watts is almost laid aside: Barlow is laid aside: and Dwight is now in fashion. Once I never heard a chapter read in one of their meeting-houses in my life; now they generally read one or two chapters on each Sunday; but mind, it is by no stated rule: they read such chapters as they

please: and no two of them read the same chapter at the same time. Once I never saw a clerical dress upon one of their ministers: now they frequently wear gowns and bands, and you can hardly distinguish them from those who are really in holy orders. Once it was offensive to call their meeting-houses *churches:* now they call them churches, and talk of going to church, when they mean meeting. Once I never heard a speech made by them at the grave, on a funeral occasion: now it is not uncommon. Once I never knew one of their ministers walk before and lead the funeral procession to the grave: now it is not uncommon. Once I never heard of baptism or the communion administered in a private house, even to a sick person, among them: and now it is sometimes done. Once I never heard of their administering the communion at their associations: and now it is sometimes done; and now I understand *they begin to ordain their Deacons.*— Once their ministers did not baptize nor administer the sacrament out of their own parishes: and now I understand they do both. Once they objected to the celebration of our Saviour's nativity on Christmas: now they begin to open their meeting-houses for worship on that day. Once they appointed their fasts in the spring, on Easter week, when all the rest of the Christian world were rejoicing at the resurrection of our Saviour: now they, with us, appoint their fasts on Good Friday, which is the day when our Saviour was crucified.— Once they objected to kneeling in prayer, even in their family worship: now they begin to practice it. And now they begin to keep holy Sunday night, which once they did not. *And there is hardly any thing in which they have not been given to change.*

In the Episcopal church we think it our duty to have our sacrifice of prayer, praise, adoration, and thanksgiving, prepared beforehand; that it be neither maimed, nor halt, nor blind; but that it be founded on the authority of God's word, and the best reason of mankind; that it be perfect as human language can make it: that it be well understood, and duly consecrated; that each one present should take a public, active, audible and visible part in it; that it be offered in the church and elsewhere, upon the altar of our hearts, and con-

sumed with the fire of love to God and good will to men, and in unison with the rest of the Christian world. In the Episcopal church, the worship of God contains every thing which the Christian religion requires it to contain: it is contained in language which every one can understand, and offered in such a manner that every man, woman, and child, who can speak, may speak, and ought to take a public, active, and audible part in it. Every minister is obliged to begin the public worship of God wth some sentences of the Holy Scriptures, and that they may all, in every part of the state, nation and country, and world, begin in the same way and with the same words at the same time, they are selected and placed in the beginning of the daily morning and evening service in the prayer book; and so soon as the minister thus begins, the whole congregation is required to arise and stand. The minister always begins with the holy scriptures, to shew that they are the foundation of his religion, the rule of his faith and conduct. The people arise and stand, to shew how willing they are to receive the word of God, and to go any where, and to do any thing to obey it, as their rising and standing naturally shew. The minister is then required to read slowly, audibly, distinctly, and understandingly, a solemn exhortation, founded upon the holy scriptures, pointing out the different parts of public worship, which they are then met together to perform, solemnizing their minds, that they should not utter any thing hastily before God; and exhorting them to join with a pure heart and humble voice in what follows. The minister and all the congregation are then required to kneel down devoutly upon their knees, and make a humble confession of their sins before God and one another. The minister says, *Almighty and most merciful Father:* the whole congregation repeat the same words after him with a loud but humble voice. He then says, *We have erred and strayed from thy ways like lost sheep:* the whole congregation repeat the same words with a loud but humble voice. He says, *We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts:* the whole congregation repeat it after him, &c. In this way there is a general and public confession made of all our sins, both original and actual, made in such general terms, that there is no son nor daughter of the

human race who cannot conscientiously join in it; and it is so particular that each one may and ought to apply it to his own case. God has sworn by himself, that *at the name of Jesus, every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess.* Here, in the Episcopal church, every knee, ministers and people, of all nations, countries and languages in all the world, does bow, and every tongue does confess. St. Paul says, "*with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation*: intimating that it was as necessary for mankind to confess with their mouths unto salvation, as it was to believe in their hearts unto righteousness. After the confession, the priest is required to arise and declare to the congregation, still kneeling, the glad tidings of the Gospel in the forgiveness of our sins, for the everlasting comfort and consolation of God's people. He declares, that "*Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, will pardon and absolve all those who truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel.*" Having humbly confessed their sins, and having heard God's merciful forgiveness pronounced by the proper officer; they are now prepared to call upon him in prayer, as their Father, not only by creation and preservation, but by reconciliation. The minister shall then kneel, and with the congregation lift up his voice aloud, and with one accord, in the Lord's prayer, which contains, in few words, all the real wants of mankind, founded upon the Christian principle of forgiveness; that God would forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us; we pray for our daily bread, which embraces all the comforts of this life; we pray that his kingdom may come, and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven, which embraces all the means of grace in this world, and the hope of glory in the world to come. After the Lord's prayer, which our blessed Saviour *has positively and expressly commanded*—Luke xi. 2, that when we did pray we should say. We then pray for Divine assistance, and then the minister and all the congregation arise, and standing, he says, *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost;* that is, glory, honour, praise, and thanksgiving, be to God the Father for creating us, to God the Son for redeeming us, and to God the Holy Ghost

for inspiring the Holy Scriptures, for sanctifying our natures, and fitting us for God's holy worship and service. The congregation, with one voice, say aloud. *As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end,;* that is, as there was glory, honor, praise, and thanksgiving, in the Jewish church, so there is now in the Christian church, and there ever shall be in the church triumphant in Heaven..— Then shall be said or sung to the glory, honor, and praise of God, a portion of the Psalms of David, *as it is appointed;* so that every minister and congregation shall worship God in the same psalms at the same time. The minister reads or sings one verse, and the congregation the next; and so on, till the psalm or portion of psalms is ended; when the minister shall say, as before, *Glory be the Father*, &c. and the congregation again say, *As it was in the beginning*, &c. Here I would observe one thing, which is very remarkable, and which it is probable, that not one person in three thousand in this country ever thought of, viz. that in all the Bible, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Revelations, there is not so much as one verse that is in rhyme or metre. I have read the Bible in English, Latin, Greek, and part of it in Hebrew, and have never been able to discover one verse which was in rhyme or metre; and there is no account that the Patriarchs, or Noah, David, or the Prophets; there is no account that our Saviour, or the Apostles or Primitive Christians ever did worship God in this way. The song of Moses and of Miriam, the psalms of David, the hymns and spiritual songs in the New-Testament, are in prose. The art of poetry, in metre and rhyme, in the time of our Saviour, and in the time of the Prophets, was in the highest state of perfection. Homer and Ovid, and Virgil and Horace, are now studied in all our colleges; and the heathen, who used to worship gods of their own invention and making, used to worship them in rhyme and metre; but those who worshipped the true God, always worshipped him in prose; and in the Episcopal church it is now enjoined upon us, *that we shall say or sing the psalms in prose*, and in this way there is no one but can join in the sacrifice; for if he cannot sing, he can read; and if he cannot read, he can learn by heart: and if he cannot learn by heart,

he can say as other folks do. The whole book of psalms is divided into thirty portions, so that it will be read through once in every month, and each minister and people read the same portion at the same time. The New Testament is read through twice every year, and most of the Old Testament once every year; and it is so ordered that every minister shall read the same chapters at the same time. My limits will not permit me to explain the whole worship of God in the Episcopal church. I can only say, that there are good and important reasons for every part of it. The Christian church was not left as the world was before it was made, *for then it was without form, and void, and darkness was upon it.*

As we expect our bodies and souls to be glorified together, it is proper that we should worship God with our bodies as well as with our souls. The church, in her worship, requires three postures of body, viz. standing, sitting and kneeling; and these should express the inward feelings and sensations of the heart. When we stand, it is to shew that our hearts are elevated in praise and adoration; when we sit, it is to shew that we are receiving instruction from our Heavenly Father; when we kneel, it is to shew our humility and our dependance upon God. Outward forms and ceremonies, without the inward feelings of the heart, are like a body without a soul, and are of little worth. The inward feelings of the heart, without outward forms and ceremonies, are like a soul without a body: too ethereal for such beings as we are; they cannot be kept steadfast on any thing; we never know where to find them. God is always the same: the general wants of all mankind are the same: and the public worship of God should always be the same. Constantly to unite in the same form of worship is not designed to change the unchangeable God, but to change ourselves to the same disposition, and a sameness of disposition creates friendship in all beings and in all worlds, and by this, says our blessed Saviour, shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you love one another. These very prayers have been used in the church almost two thousand years; they elevated the hearts, they warmed the affections, they prepared the souls of holy martyrs, and confessors, and primitive Christians for crowns of

glory; they were the means of grace to my ancestors and friends who have gone before me, they have supported me in my troubles, and carried me through many temptations.—O, that I could conform my soul more thoroughly to the disposition and sentiments which they contain and enjoin. I leave them as my best legacy to my children, that when they join fervently in them, they may know how their father felt, and learn to feel in devotion, as he did; and as all good Christians have done who have gone this way before them.

In the Episcopal church the minister generally performs the service in one place and preaches in another; and at one time he is dressed in a white surplice, at another time he is dressed in a black gown. The reason is, that he sustains two different offices, viz. that of a Priest and that of a Prophet.—When he is peforming the service, he is exercising the office of a priest: he is in the reading desk, and is dressed in white, and is then speaking to the Almighty in behalf of himself and of the people. White is to shew how pure the office of the priesthood is, and how pure our hearts and lives should be when we address a God of infinite purity and holiness. He then goes into the pulpit and is dressed in black, and is exercising the office of a prophet, and is speaking to the people in behalf of the Almighty; warning them of their danger, and pointing out to them their duty. Black is to shew how grave the office of a prophet is, and how solemn the important embassy is which he is about to deliver to a guilty world in God's name.

If we take a geographical view of every part of the habitable world, where shall we find any nation or country which have embraced the Christian faith, or do now embrace it, where the Episcopal church has not been received and acknowledged as the true medium through which we must enter into the kingdom of glory. Almost as universally as the Bible has been received, so universally has the government of the Christian church by bishops, as the successors of the Apostles, been received, until Korah-like, it was said that the whole congregation were holy, every one of them, &c.: *and for opposing this and an oppressive union of church and state, I have suffered two years imprisonment, and do now suffer the*

loss of all things. The Episcopal church is now and always has been the established religion of Norway, of Denmark and of Sweden; of Iceland and Greenland; of Germany and the whole Russian empire; of Austria, Bohemia, Hungary and Poland; of Portugal, Spain, France, and Italy. The Roman Catholics are Episcopalians, and perform the same worship that we do, and *a great deal more, which we say is idolatrous, superstitious, and anti-christian.* The Greek church in Turkey in Europe, and in Asia, is an Episcopal church. The Lutherans are Episcopalians, and so are the Methodists.—England, Ireland, and a great part of Scotland, are Episcopalians The East Indies, the West Indies, and a very great part of the United States, are Episcopalians. Yet Mr. Lanman says, *it is only the pretended Christian religion.*

Let any man take a map of the world, and put his finger on any part of the habitable globe, where the Christian religion has been received and acknowledged, and there the Episcopal church has also been received and acknowledged as a part of it. I appeal to every man of common science, truth, and candor, as a witness of the truth of what I say. Because are some republicans in England, it will not be correct to say that England is a republic. Because there are some Monarchists in the United States, it will not be correct to say that they are a Monarchy. Because there are some Presbyterians and others, in Europe, and because there are some Congregational Presbyterians, and others, in Connecticut, and elsewhere, it will not be correct to say that the Christian church is not an Episcopal church. Of all the different sectaries and persuasions, we know the time when they began, we know the place where they began, and we know the persons by whom they began. Now let any one do this of the Episcopal church, short of Moses and Aaron in the Jewish church, and short of our Saviour and the Apostles in the Christian church and the controversy will be at an end. We name every High Priest IN SUCCESSION from Aaron to Christ, and every Bishop IN SUCCESSION from Christ to this present day. Christ has been with them always, and the gates of hell, according to divine promise, have not prevailed. Aaron was appointed and invested with authority to

act in God's name, 1491 years before Christ, and the authority was handed down in the following SUCCESSION, collected with great care and labor from the Holy Scriptures, Josephus, and other writers, viz.

1 Aaron.
2 Eleazer.
3 Phineas.
4 Abishua.
5 Bukki.
6 Uzzi.
7 Zerachiah.
8 Meracoth.
9 Amariah.
10 Ahitub.
11 Zadock.
12 Ahimaaz,
13 Azariah.
14 Johanan.
15 Azariah.
16 Amariah.
17 Ahitub.
18 Zadoc.
19 Shallum.
20 Hilkiah.
21 Azariah.
22 Saraiah.
23 Jehozadock, who was taken captive and carried into Babylon 599 years before the birth of Christ, and was succeeded by
24 Josia.
25 Joakim.
26 Eliashil.
27 Jehoida, II.
28 Jonathan.
29 Jaddus.
30 Onias, I.
31 Simon the Just.
32 Eleazer, II.
33 Manasses.
34 Onias, II.
35 Simon, II.
36 Onias, III.
37 Jason.
38 Manelaus.
39 Lysmanchus.
40 Aleimus.
41 Matathias.
42 Judas Macabeus
43 Jonathas.
44 Simon, III
45 John called Hircan.
46 Aristobulus.
47 Alex'r. Jannius.
48 Hyrcan.
49 Aristobulus.
50 Hyrcan.
51 Antigonus.
52 Ananal.
53 Aristobulus.
54 Ananel.
55 Jesu son of Phabes.
56 Simon.
57 Matthias.
58 Joazar,
59 Eleazar, III.
60 Jesus son of Sias.
61 Ishmael.
62 Eleazer, IV.
63 Simon.
64 Caiaphas, who was High Priest when Christ was crucified.
65 Jonathus & Theophilus.
66 Simon, sirnamed Canthus.
67 Matthias, II.
68 Elionee.
69 Simon Cantheas.
70 Joseph call'd Caba.
71 Ananus.
72 Ishmael.
73 Joseph.
74 Ananus, son of Ananus.
75 Jesus, son of Damneus.
76 Jesus, son of Gamaliel.
77 Matthias, III.
78 Phanassus was High Priest when Jerusalem was taken from the Jews, A. D. 61.

Jesus Christ was baptized when he was 30 years of age, and that, according to the law of Moses, was his *consecration*

or ordination. A voice then came from Heaven, saying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye Him; he was invested with authority to act in God's name, which has been transmitted with the Holy Scriptures from Christ to the present time, 1826, in the following SUCCESSION, viz.

A. D.	A. D.	A. D.
30 Jesus Christ.	297 Marcellinus.	578 Pelagius.
44 St. Peter settled in Rome.	304 Marcellus.	590 Gregorius Magnus.
59 St. Paul came to England.	309 Eusebius.	596 Augustinus Monachus.
70 Linus.	311 Miltiades.	614 Laurentius.
81 Cletus.	314 Sylvester.	619 Melitus.
93 Clemens.	336 Marcus.	624 Justus.
103 Anacletus.	337 Julius.	634 Honorius.
112 Euarestus.	352 Liberinus.	654 Adeodatus.
121 Alexander.	385 Felix, II.	668 Theodorus.
132 Sextus.	398 Anastricus.	693 Brithwaldus.
142 Telesphorus.	402 Innocentius.	731 Fatwinus.
154 Hygenus.	417 Zozimus.	735 Northelmus.
158 Pius.	419 Bonifacius, I.	740 Cuthbertus.
167 Anicetus.	424 Celestinus.	759 Bregwinus.
175 Soter.	432 Sextus, III.	762 Lambertus.
179 Eleatherus.	440 Leo Magnus.	791 Athelandus.
194 Victor.	461 S. Hilarichus.	804 Wolfredus.
203 Zepherinus.	468 Simplicius.	829 Theogildus.
221 Calistus.	483 Felix, III.	830 Ceolnathus.
227 Urbanus.	492 S. Gelasius.	871 Atheldridus.
233 Pontianus.	497 Anastasius.	889 Pleagmundis.
238 Antherus.	499 Symmachus.	915 Athelmus.
239 Fabianus.	514 Hormisda.	924 Wolfelmus.
254 Cornelius.	524 Joannis, I.	934 Odo.
255 Lucius.	526 Felix, IV.	959 Dunstan.
257 Stephanus.	530, Bonafacius.	988 Ethelgarus.
260 Sextus, II.	532 Joannes, II.	990 Siricius.
261 Dionysus.	535 Agapetus.	993 Alfricus.
273 Felix, I.	537 Sylverius.	1006 Elfigus.
275 Eutychianus.	540 Virginius.	1013 Livingus.
284 Cajus.	555 Palagias.	1020 Agelnathus.
	560 Joannes, III.	
	573 Benedictus.	

1038 Eadlinus.
1050 Robertus.
1052 Stigandus.
1070 Lanfrancus.
1089 Anselm.
1114 Rodolphus.
1122 Wm. Carboyl.
1138 Theobaldus.
1162 Thos. Becket.
1171 R. Monachus.
1184 Baldwin.
1191 R.F. Jocelyn.
1193 Hu'rt.Walter.
1206 Stph.Langton
1229 R.Wethershed
1234 Edmond.
1244 Boniface.
1273 Rt. Kilwarby.
1278 Jno. Peckam.
1295 Robert Winchelsey.
1313 W. Reynolds.
1327 S. Mepham.
1333 Jno.Stratford
1348 Thoms Bradwarden.
1349 Simon Islipp.
1366 S. Langham.
1367 W.Whittlesey
1375 S. Sudbury.
1381 Wm.Courtney
1396 Thos.Arundel
1414 H. Chichiley.
1443 John Stafford.
1452 John Kemp.
1454 T. Bourchier.
1486 John Morton.
1502 Henry Dean.
1504 Wm. Warham
1533 Thos. Cranmer.
1555 Reginald Pool
1559 Mat. Parker.
1575 Edm. Grindal
1583 Jno. Whitgift.
1605 Rd. Bancroft.
1610 G. Abbott.
1633 Wm. Laud.
1660 Wm. Jaston.
1992 James Sharp.
Gilbert Shelton.
William Sancroft.
J. Tillotson.
Thomas Tennison.
William Wake.
J. Potter.
Thomas Herring.
Thomas Sekcer.
S. Cornwallis,
J. Moore.
Samuel Provoost, the first Bishop in N. York, and by whom I was ordained.
Benjamin Moore.
J. H. Hobart, the present Bishop of N. Y. 1826.
Saml. Seabury was the first Bishop in Conn. who was succeeded by
Abrhm. Jarvis, who was succeeded by
Thomas C. Brownell, the present Bishop, 1826.

Bishops in Massachusetss.

Rt. Rev. Dr. Bass.
Parker.
Griswold.

Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, page 606, Folio, Greek and Latin edition, has furnished the names of the Bishops who succeeded the Apostles in many of the most important churches for about 500 years after Christ. And the foregoing succession is supported by him, by Mason and Lindsley on the English Ministry, Cave's Lives of the Fathers, Dupin, Echard, Warner, &c. &c. and by history in general: so that if I err, it is in good company. The fact, however, is undeniable, that the Bible and Episcopal church have been transmitted together in every part of the world, and to deny this, is to deny the holy scriptures. How do we know that the

Bible which we now acknowledge and use, is the same which was used a thousand years ago? I answer, because it has been acknowledged, received and used as such in all parts of the world; there have always been some who would not acknowledge its divine authority, nor submit to its injunctions. How do we know that the Episcopal church is the true church of Christ? I answer, because it has been acknowledged, received and used in all parts of the world; there have always been some sectaries who would not acknowledge its authority, nor submit to its ordinances, but this does not prove the church to be wrong. If any Denomination can trace their succession as the Episcopalians can, we are willing to give them *the right hand of fellowship*. Think not, I beseech you, that this is a matter of small consequence, for as I have already observed, page 13 and 166, as is our authority, such must be our administrations. And he who departs from the government of any society, does *ipso facto* depart from the society itself. If the Episcopal government of the Christian church be its true government, and the authority to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, was given to that church, is contained in that church, and has been transmitted to us by a succession in that church, it must be evident that it is dangerous to depart from that church; and that it is the duty and interest, yea, the immortal interest of every one to return to that church, from which neither they nor their fathers ought ever to have separated. Those are the sincere sentiments of my heart; and I beseech the reader not to think me his enemy, because I am not a hypocrite, because I do not ask his friendship at the expense of every thing which may be valuable to an immortal soul. If I be mistaken, I pray God, and you, and the world, to forgive me. My excuse is, I have carefully examined the case in the fear of God, I have read, and prayed, and inquired; and the result is, I do believe the Episcopal church to be of divine origin and authority; that in it the sacraments are rightly and truly administered; that the means of divine grace are there truly dispensed; that the doctrines are in every point of view honorable to God, useful to man, and agreeable to the scriptures; and that the worship is founded upon the authority of God's

word; is edifying, and agreeable to the best reason of mankind, and is in unison with the rest of the Christian world. For these reasons I am a CHURCHMAN; for these reasons I have endeavored to instruct others; and for these reasons I have suffered twenty years persecution, and two years imprisonment in Norwich Jail, in Connecticut, under the false and feigned charge of crimes which I never did commit, and which never came into my mind.

O, God, Merciful Father, who despisest not the sighing of a contrite heart, nor the desires of such as are sorrowful; mercifully assist my prayers which I make before thee, in all my troubles and adversities, whensoever they oppress me; and graciously hear me, that all those evils, which the craft and subtlety of the devil or man worketh against me, may, by thy good providence be brought to nought; that I thy servant, being hurt by no persecutions, may ever more give thanks unto thee in thy holy church, through Jesus Christ our Lord: who hath mercifully taught and expressly commanded us, that when we pray we should say—"Our Father who art in Heaven," &c.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

PLEASE to accept my grateful acknowledgements of the candour, which you have manifested in lending an ear to hear the complaints of a fellow citizen, who is also a fellow Christian. All mankind are naturally and mutually dependant upon God and upon each other. It has fallen to me, to appeal to you and to the world, as arbiters, in a case wherein I, my children, and friends, claim to have been extremely injured, in defending our just rights, and those of society. How far my complaints are well founded, you must and will judge for yourselves, when you have read this book; and how far you are interested in the case, may be inferred by considering what would be the effect upon society, if all were to turn their eyes and to stop their ears, from the complaints of their fellow creatures. If any apology be necessary for what I have stated in regard to the congregational presbyterians in Conn. and in favor of the Episcopal church; let it be remembered, that

Mr. Lanman complained of me, for being a preacher, *pretendedly of the Christian religion*! as though the Episcopal church was only *the pretended* Christian religion; and 12 men *under oath*, in N. London county, in Conn. in 1820, have declared *that it was true;* and they said it with as much propriety, and no more, than they said the other charges against me were true. I can truly say, that the great wish of my heart has been to be a good man, *true and trusty*. The great object of my preaching is, and has been, to represent the God of Heaven, in the most amiable and pleasing point of view possible, and to persuade myself and all others, from the disposition of the heart, to love him and imitate him. I have been beloved by my Heavenly Father and favored with ten thousand blessings; for which, like Joseph of old, *I have been hated by my brethren*, and in one sense, sold into Egypt: but, like Baron Trenck, I have come out of Jail, and walk proudly before Kings and the whole world! My friends are glad to see me, and to treat me with respect; my enemies are ashamed and afraid, and hide themselves from my presence. More than 2000 people, east of Hartford in Conn. subscribed to have my Memoirs printed, and have received them. About 1500 in the county of Saratoga, where I used to reside, and in that neighborhood, have subscribed to have them re-printed. The design is to promote the cause of truth and justice, and to suppress lying, perjury, wickedness and vice. *I know that this book is true*, and there is hardly a fact of importance which is not supported by the testimony of witnesses who are now living, and certified by the civil authority of the state.

I beseech thee, O Merciful God, to grant that this book may be entertaining and useful to all who will read it, or hear it read: be pleased to give us patience and resignation in all our afflictions, to direct us in all our doings with thy most gracious favor; guard us from all error, and lead us into all truth and righteousness, and at last receive us into that blessed and happy world where all tears shall be wiped from all eyes, and where one unclouded day of bliss and glory shall surround us forever and ever: grant it, O Heavenly Father, for Jesus Christ's sake.—*Amen.* Our Father who art in Heaven, &c. *Amen.*

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

Ballston, N. Y.
John Ball
Levi Benedict
William Betts
Robert Bennett
John Beebe
William H. Bridges
L. W. Bostwick
Consider Chard &
Elijah Taylor
Joseph Cole
William Clark
William Callen
William Coon
Hezekiah Cutler
Hiram P. Caswell
William Copp
Daniel Cook
John Cutler
John Crapo
A. Danforth
John Dunning
John S. Davis
Waterman Kingsley
William Kingsley
William Ford
Stephen Fox
Ebenezer Fuller
Lewis Gray
William Knight
Hiram Howard
David How
Isaac Hiller
Epenetus How
Seth Howard
Ezekiel Horton
Martin Kellogg
William G. Knight
Edmund Jennings
J. W. Jennings
James Quivey
Joel Lee
Benjamin Lord
Joseph Lord
William Lord
Henry Leonard
Nathaniel Leonard
James A. M'Donald
Derick Mowry
Nathaniel Millard
James Mosher
M. McDonald
Jesse Mowry
Wm. McGregor
Barzilla Millard
John Miller, Jr.
Ralph R. Mann
Walter Nott
J. W. McMaster
John Monro
S. B. Noble
Harvey S. Larkins
Ebenezer Pool
Solomon Parkis
John Parent
Bemslee Peters
Nathaniel B. Parker
E. B. Robins
Peter Roe
Enos *P.* Root
N. J. Seeley
Henry Seymour
James Sears
Wm. H. Satterlee
Edward G. Smith
A. D. Stewart
Jonathan Smith
E. B. Sparkes
James Smith
William Smith
Egbert Shaw
Lewis Southerland
William Saunders
Daniel Tippet
Michael Trumble
R. A. Wright
Andrew Watrous
Edward Watrous
William Wheeler
B. *P.* Wilkens
George Watson
John Wandell
Winthrop Young
Milton, N. Y.
Thomas Arnold
John Ambler
Josiah Arnold
John S. Andrews
John Ashman
Alson Adams
Henry Allen
John Barker

David Barber
Elias Benedict
William G. Boss
Hiram Boss
Elias Baldwin
David Boss
A. B. Benedict
Lewis Benedict.
Joseph Bouton, Jr.
Samuel Bouton
Nicholas Brown
Isaac N. Bouton
Elias Bentley
John Barber
David Chatfield
William Cole
Benedict Clark
Piersons Crane
Jonathan Crawford
Lyman Cook
Daniel Couch
Peter Coon
Alex'r. M. Christie
Ebenezer Dibble
Isaac Darrow
Henry Debois
C. Debois, Jr.
Jacob Eighme
Nicholas S. Eighme
John Eldred
Evert W. Fuller
Elisha Erench
John Frost
Lemon Foot
Lyman Felton
Josiah Francisco
James Green
Samuel Gleason
John Gil is
Samuel Hope

James Hawkins
James Hawkins, jr.
Hez. R. Hoyt
Victory H. Hoyt
Joseph Hanchett
Stephen Hyatt
Sebe Lewis
William Lucas
Taylor Johnson
Silas H. Lindsley
David Lacey
Phillip J. Kellogg
John Knap
Elijah Kellogg
Harry Kilmore
Anson Lounsbury
John Lyon
Charles McCabe
Carlton Morehouse
David Moore
J. Morey, jr.
G.A. F. McHolland
Moses Moore
Hugh Morrison
Reuben Merritt
John McDeormid
P. Nichols
Lewis Northrop
Leman Nimss
Nath'l. Palmerton
Cyrel Parkhust
Isaac D. Potter
Marshal *P*ayson
Jacob Randal, jr.
*H*iram Rowland, 2
Robert R. Rowland
P. Roberts
V. Rathbone
Giles *H*. Russel
Isaac Rowland, jr.

Elisha Rockwell
Robert Spiers
Isaac Sears
Miner Sherwood
Abraham Shears
Abijah Steves
Jabez Swift
Thos. T. St.John
George Thompson
Timothy Tallman
Simon *P*. Vedder
Aaron Van Ostrand
Ezekiel Whalen .
Nelson Walter
Abel Whalen
Silas Wood
William Whitman
William T. Welch
David Wood
Jonathan Wescott
Galway, N. Y.
John Alexander
Richard Adams
Sylvanus Allen
Joseph Blood
*He*nry Ball
Thomas D. Burk
Ezra Billings
Wakeman Burr
Eliphalet Brush
Joseph Brewster
Emor S. Ballou
Dudley Bartlett
Elijah Curtis
Aaron Cable
Stephen Clark
Samuel Cole
Russel Chamberlin
Uriah Cornell
Barton Cole, 2d

Ebenezer Couch
Jabez Comstock
Spencer Cook
Reuben Cogswell
Paul Davis
Pardon Davis
Joseph Dod
James Davis
John Dean
Matthias Enos
Jonathan Edgcomb
Solomon Fancher
William Gere
Alfred Hull
John Huyck, jr.
Stephen C. Hayes
Henry Hollister
Elias Hedges
Tristram Haynes
George Hanford
Jacob Johnson
Daniel D. Jones
William B. Knox
P. H. McComber
Jabez King, jr.
Daniel Mecker
Obed Olmsted
Pinkham Mosher
Duncan McMartin
Caleb Northrop
Lewis E. Northrop
Thomson Northrop
Ammi Northrop
Lewis Northrop
Jabez S. Northrop
Benjamin Palmer
James Parlin
Alexander S. Platt
Josiah Pullin

Lemuel C. Paine
Seth Pettit
W. S. Palmer
Matilda Potter
James Pettit
Joseph Pinney
Israel Phelps
Daniel Rogers
Ephriam Rudes
Earl Stimson
Benham Smith
Charles G. Smith
James Sterdevan
Gilbert Swan
Stephen Swan
Joshua Swan
Benjamin Slade
Preserved Slade
C. W. Swan
Chester Stebbins
Ithel Smith
James N. Smith
R. D. Sherman
Joseph Sowles
Job Sowl
Ruth Tripp
Noah Vibbard, 2d
Noah Vibbard
Ephriam Wheeler
T. H. Wakeman
J. Wightman
Henry Weed
Simon Weeks
Jonathan York
Charlton, N. Y.
Samuel Allen
James Anderson
Samuel Belden
Charles T. Brown

Robert Benedict, jr.
Isaiah Bolt
Henry Bown
Benjamin Bolt
John Bell
Daniel Beach
James Bunyan
Densey Benjamin
William Bunyan
Asa Bartlett
John Bailey
David Bradley
William Bradley
Matthias Barhydt
Asher Cox
John Cook
Caty Callen
Nathan Clark
Martin L. Curtiss
Isaac S. Conde
James Callaghan
Hannah Callaghan
Thomas Clark
Emanuel Consoles
Peter Condy
Lewis Crawford
Samuel Crankshaw
Eleazer Dows
Luke Dows
David Dows
Philo Dunning
Thomas Dows
G. H. Elliot
A. Ferguson
William Fowler
William Ferris
Wm. Gilchrist, 2d
John I. Gilchrist
Elisha Genne

A. Gilchrist
Alvan Isbel
Seth Kirby
James Johnson
Stephen Holmes
John Holmes
Esther Hayes
Abram Hodgton
Sylvester Hermon
Araunah Hubbel
E. S. Hanford
Luther Herrick
Mark Hallowell
John R. Hendrick
Nathan S. Hollister
Thomas Laird
John Low
John Laird
Abram Lewis
Matthew La Rue
James Laird
Henry Mead
William Morehouse
James McKnight
Timothy Marvin
Joseph McKnight
John McWilliams
John McHarry
Ogden Miller
David Maxwell
John R. Maxwell
William Morford
B. K. Northrop
Joseph Nearing
Daniel Ostrom
Seymour Pardee
Abigial Powers
James Parent
Sedate Paddleford

David Putman
Henry Richie
James Richie
Moses Smith
Abby Sherwood
Silas N. Sherwood
J. R. Spencer.
Abel Seeley.
RensselaerSchuyler
Daniel Skinner
Benjamin Shader
William Taylor
Edward Taylor
E. Trumbel
William Truax
A. R. Vosbourg
Isaac Valantine
Frederic Valentine
J. T. Valentine
A. K. Underhill
John L. Watkins
John Watkins
Oliver Wicks
Aaron Wilson
Wilson Wicks
C. T. Wilkinson
Ahasueras Wendell
R. C. Worden
Greenfield, N. Y.
Seth Austin
John M. Anthony
Nathan Austin
Otis Ballou
John J. Benedict
James Batchellor
Alfred Bosworth
Asa C. Barney
Duty Ballou
James Bliss

Alonson Ballou
Joshua Bearber
Ray Bracket
Charles Bump
James Curtiss
Charles Carpenter
Walter Drake
Joseph Deuel
Edmond Deuel
Ezra Day
A. Deuel
George Flemming
B. C. Easterbrooks
Alexander Edwards
La Fayette Graton
B. C. Grennell
Han'h W. Grummon
John Gifford
John Gifford, 2d.
Jonathan W. Gifford
Ahimaz Garnsey
Henry Hines
Robert Hagadorn
Lyman Haythorn
John Hanson
John Harris
Stephen Harris
Samuel A. Hurd
John Hawley
Thomas Huston
Potter Johnson
Darius Johnson
Nathaniel Lovell
Stephen Linnan
John H. Lyon
Otis Lapham
George W. Lincoln
Olney Latham
Abner Medbery

Hiram Medbery
Jesse Munson
Joseph Marks
Rogers McComber
John S. Miller
Hylas Morrison
Parker Manning
Anson A. Newton
Thomas J. Porter
John Page
Henry Peacock
James Peacock, jr.
C. G. Pettit
Silas Reynolds
Sol. Richardson
Abraham Ross
Stephen Sellick
James Sax
Amasa Scofield
Isaac Seymour
David Salisbury
Silas Salisbury
S. B. Sherwood
Orley B. Sherman
Lewis Scott
Alexander H. Scott
George Sax
Thomas Seymour
Herman Y. Sweeny
Elijah Smith
AlexanderW Smith
Hannah St. John
John Smith
Joseph S. Streeter
Levi Smith
Seymour Talmadge
Seth Talmadge
Simon Visscher
Philan. Van Arnam
John S. Weed
Henry C. Weed
Elisha Wing
Edwin C. Weed
David Williams
Ezra Wilson
Nehemiah Wing
Samuel Westcot

Corinth, N. Y.

Aaron Aldrich
Thomas Andrew
Braddock Andrew
William Bacon
Isaac Burns
Isaac Barber
Lucas Blood
Thomas Burritt
William Brown
Jesse Burrass
James Brown
Benjamin Cooper
Wash'n. Chapman
Nathaniel Calkins
John W. Creal
Theron Calkins
Edward Cole
Cyrus Creal
Nathaniel Cowles
Isaac A. Center
Lucius Chadderdon
Asahel Deuel
Chancey G. Dibble
Levi Dibble
Jeremiah Eddy
Isaac Edwards
Benjamin Grippin
Isaac Grippin
Eseck Grippin
William Grippin
Joel Haskin
Levi Heath
Joseph Hunter
Matthew Harsha
Samuel S. Holden
Rufus Herrick
Thomas Heath
Ira Heath
William Jones
Rodman Ide
Benjamin Ide
Timothy Ide
Hugh Kennedy
Amaziah Kingsbury
Isaac M. Lamphere
Jeduthan Lindsey
Hiram Lindsey
E. C. Lindsey
Daniel Morrel
James Mosher
Henry Matterson
Peter Mallery
Samuel McCrea
Hannah McComber
Jos. P. Ostrander
John Purqua
Simon Padden
David Rogers
William Raymond
Nathaniel Reaves
Stephen Raymond
Samuel Smith
James H. Searls
Bela Sage
David Stanley
Joseph Stafford
Eseck Turtellott
Read Turtellot

Nathaniel Warden
Oliver Weston
E. A. Woodworth
Obadiah Wood
Hiram H. Wilson
Gershom Wildey
Ezekiel Woodward
Lewis White

Luzerne, N. Y.
Samuel Atwell
Abel Allen
Anson Barrows
Elijah Battolph
Arvin Finch
William R. *Hunt*
Barney P. *Hogle*
Luke Lindsey
W. B. Martindale
Herbert Mallery
James Orton
Ira Orton
Gardner Rogers
Horace Smith
Allen Seymour
Thaddeus Sillick
Daniel Sprague
Ansel Smith
John S. Tinney
Sillick Weed
Josephus Wells.

Wilton. N. Y.
Ziba Arnold
Philip Allen
Stephen Arnold
Jacob Burtch
John Brill
Austin L. Bradley
William Comstock
Stafford Carr
Thomas Comstock
Walter Doe
Justus Durham
David Dunn
Arad Ellis
Elijah Ellis
C. I. Fonda
Abner Hawley, jr.
William Gearn
Ezekial Lockwood
Stephen King
Henry H. King
William Loring
Cyrus Perry
Ziba Philips
George Parsol
Lau. Rheubotom
Henry Reynolds
Isaac Shaw
B. I. Swartwout
Philip Terril
Jon. Woodward
Daniel *Washburn*
John R. *Williams*
Benj. *Woodman.*

Hadley. N. Y.
John Johnson
John Park, &c.

Providence, N. Y.
Stephen Allen
David Barker
John Barker
Asa Barker
Jacob Conklin
James Conklin
Stephen A. Cory
Jeremiah Clark
Benedict A. Clark
John Cranson
James Carpenter
Uriah Cornell
George *Hunt*
Hiram S. Kirkland
Jacob R. *Howard*
Salmon Pullin
Harvey Jeffers
Peleg R. Slocum
Michael Smith
George Taylor
Noah Taylor
John *Watson.*

Johnstown. N. Y.
Baltis Argenseners
J. P. Bowen
A. G. Brower
P. G. Brower
Jacob Burk
Abraham Cuyler
John Cameron
W. S. Campbel
Luman Clark
H. Cunningham
B. Chamberlin
R. S. Clute
Catharine Campbel
John B. Davis
Richard Dodge
Charles Easton
James Frazer
Daniel Forbes
Abner Field, jr.
G. D. Ferguson
Joseph Farmer

Volkard Gardinier
N. Garlock
Charles Hoag
Cornelius Hoffman
M. Houghtaling
Abraham Hanson
Benjamin Hess
Henry Hart, jr.
Duncan Hay
Mortimer Haring
S. E. Hurlbert
P. S. Hildreth
Peter Harder
Henry A. Holland
Silas Hulet
N. N. Hill
Heathcoat Johnson
Peter Keith
John J. Keller
A. McKinley
Abraham Luke
Abraham Morrel
John McCarty
James McDonald
D. McDonald
James McFarlin
Andrew Monro
John McArthur, jr.
Peter McKee
John McMartin
D. D. McArthur
John McKenzie
James McLeish
Hugh McColl
Alinos Matthews
James McVean
Joseph Newton
John Nicloy
James Putman

Fisher Putman
E. N. Prindle
Daniel Potter
James Piersons
W. S. Philpot
John B. Rogers
Philip Reynolds, jr.
T. A Stontenburgh
Hugh Sanford
Dennis Searles
Magdalin Stoller
Edmond Slattery
William Settle
Nathan Souls
Amasa Shippie
Adam W. Snyder
Samuel H. Taft
Oliver Taylor
William Vosburgh
W. Van Heusen
Teunis Van Sice
Jacob Van Vleet
Peter A. Vosburgh
Barent A. Vosburgh
Arnold Webb
Asahel Whitney
Seth Witmore
Jeremiah Wood
Joseph Whalen
Peter Wetmore
G. T. Wells
A. P. Yates
Henry Fry Yates

Saratoga Springs.

A. H. Andrews
Samuel Burtis
David Bullard
J. D. Barrows
W. Brots

Nehemiah Barlow
Gardner Bullard
John Bryan
John L. Bull
Prentice Brown
Cyrel Carpenter
Wallace Crawford
Joel Clement
Seth Covil
Gideon Conant
E. W. Curtiss
James Carragan
Edwin S. Crane
J. W. Chesney
Samuel H. Drake
John Dusty
Judiah Elsworth
J. E. Elsworth
Abel Ellis
A. W. Field
John Freeman
A. H. Fish
G. Fridenburgh
Harmon Foster
James P. Finch
Salmon Huling
Jonathan Hanford
Ezra Knap
Daniel Lake
R. W. Lee
W. A. Langworthy
William Murphy
Isaac R. Martin
Hugh S. Mosher
Daniel Matthews
Jesse Morgan
Runion Martin
Alonzo Newell
Peter Newman

Elias Newland
Daniel Ostrander
Timothy Parker
B. R Putnam
Oliver Perkins
Joseph Palmer
Turner Peterson
William Perry
Lewis Putnam
Titus Palmer
Joshua Porter
Henry Rayner
Samuel Rogers
John H. Steel
Thomas T. Smith
Lois H. Stilson
Dolphus Skinner
Solomon Spaulding
James Stearns
Willard Stratton
Risley Taylor
Hiram Tuttle
Ira Thompson
James Vail
Peter V. Wiggins
Clement Winston
Josiah C. Waldo
Josiah Westcot
Elijah W. Weed
Darius Wright
John Weeks
Smith Wheeler

Amsterdam, N. Y.

Benedict Arnold
Alexander Adams
James Bell
Abraham J. Berry
Thomas Bunn
William Beedel
John R. Barlow
Michael Borst
Timothy Crane
Zebulon Cook
James Cushney
Charles T. Clark
J. M. McCollum
Abner Ceaser
AlexanderDavidson
John French
J. Duke
Aaron W. Hull
Abner Herrick
James Kline
Israel Loomis
Jubal Livermore
George Maxwell
John McGinnis
Ezekiel Mosher
John Olmsted
Abraham Pullin
Matilda Putman
William H. Pearce
Marcus T.Reynolds
John Scott
Archibald Stewart
W. S. Shuler
Hugh Sample
J. A. Sturtevant
Reuben Sargent
A. Van Arnam
George Weltch

Mayfield, N. Y.

Henry Armington
Elijah Alvoid
Richard Butler
John Cutler
Peter Carmichael
Allen Case
Rufus Clark
David Cleaveland
J. W. Dickerson
A. McFarlin
John Frank
Josiah M. Hunt
Joshua Johnson
Robert Mitchel
Joseph Major
Jesse Peck
Oliver Rice
James Stewart
Frederick Sherman
F. Van Benren
Luke Woodworth

Broadalbin, N. Y.

Arvey Bartlett
George A. Barse
Silas Collins
Thomas Cleaveland
Jesse Churchill
Enoch Cornwell
William Chalmers
David Demarest
T. Dunham
William Easton
Peter Knox
Elmenier Fuller
B. W. Hazard
Peter Gilchrist
William Horsewell
Robert Hallowell
James Murray
A. McMartin
J. J. Robertson
James I. Rose
Daniel Rice
Tiffany B. Tyler

Lyman Tanner
M. *Weston*
Peter Van Vranken
George *W.* Wilcox
James Lockert
J. Schermerhorn

Schenectady, N. Y.
Caleb Allen
H. R. Allen
Edwin Alvoid
William H. Brown
Philip Brotherson
John N. Barhydt
John S. Bonny
J. Broderick
P. H. Brooks
Samuel Baxter
Daniel C. Bradt
Corn's. L. Barhydt
John C. Barhydt
John Brotherson
John H. Brooks
G. Q. Carley
Benjamin Conant
Smith Chase
Patrick Cherdon
Peter R. Chevalier
John G. Carley
RobertCunningham
J. W. Clark
Obed Chandler
Elihd L. Davis
James Dows
John I. De Graff
Garret Dunbar
Calvin Devott
Mrs. A. Dole

P. Dunspaugh
Jacob Deforest, jr.
William Ennis
C. D. Felthousen
Robert M. Fuller
Jacob G. Fonda
Samuel Freeman
Lewis Frink
Erastus Gleason
William Gorsline
A. Gombault
Joseph Healy
Benjamin Homan
Billings Hayward
William H. Hill
Oliver Hatch
James Hall
Edward James
John G. Joyce
John Klein
John Kelly
David Low
A. L. Linn
Charles Lawrence
Caleb Lyon
David Lyon
Benjamin Lyons
Joseph Langdon
Silas Lansing
William Lee, jun.
John Mosier
John I. Mynderse
David M. Moore
Henry Miller
William Meeker
J. C. Magoffin
Isaac Meeker
Isaac S. Miller
William McCamus

James McKenney
George McQueen
Jas. C. McKenney
Robert Osborn
David Prime
John Ohlen
Harmanus Peek
Joseph Y. Peek
Geo. Ritchie, jun.
George Ross
A. G. Rynecks
Artemas Radford
Henry P. Rosa
Elisha P. St. John
Daniel Slyter
Garret Stevens
John Schermerhorn
Ryer Schermerhorn
William Slyter
Herman Swits
Law. Schoolcraft
George Sims
Alexander Swits
Jas. W. Tichenor
Alex. V. Tillman
Daniel J. Toll, jun.
Sebastian Olsaver
Albert A. Vedder
John Van Voast
Jacob Van Antwerp
G. G. Van Zandt
John S. Vrooman
Giles Van Antwerp
C. Van Vranken
John B. Van Zandt
Richard Van Voast
John I. Vedder
Jacob G. Van Eps
George W. Ward

Harman Waggoner
James *Walsh*
P. C. *Wemple*
William A. Watson
John I. Yates
Isaac I. Yates.

Glenville, N. Y.
Thaddeus *Bolt*
John S. *Barhydt*
Garret *Bradt*
Rich. *Brumaghim*
John Cole
Timothy Chapman
Jesse Bows
Lawrence Gardiner
Elias C. Groot
Charles Geer
John C. Geer
Simon Glen, jun.
Alexander Hunt

Wm. S. Hagadorn
Henry *Hogan*
George *W.* Johnson
Abraham Riggs
John Shaw
Silvanus S. Millard
Ebenezer Slott
B. Sanders
Tobias Teller
William I. Teller
David *Walker*
Wessel H. Wessels

Chatham, N. Y.
Philo Beebe
Roswell *Beebe*
Edwards *Beebe*
Peter R. Crandal, 4
Harry S. Clark
John S. Clark
Seth *Bradley*

Abner Doty
Hezekiah *Hurlbert*
R. *B.* Frisbie
William H. Johnson
Lansing King
Hosea Martin
Daniel Smith
John V. Fitch
Jesse Waterman
F. Y. Waterman
S. Van Volkenburg
B. Van Volkenburg
and others.

Albany, N. Y.
John Dows
Robert *Hitchcock*
John *Beach*
Hugh McGrath
Frederick Seger,
and others.

N. B. About 400 more names of those who have subscribed for this book, or agreed to take and pay for it, are unavoidably omitted. Some mistakes in the names, and in the body of the work, will be noticed by the reader, and easily corrected.

University of British Columbia Library

DUE DATE

ET—6

UNIVERSITY OF B.C. LIBRARY
3 9424 03449 8417